The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 17, Number 4 July / August 1998

Swiss Court Punishes Revisionists

Repression of Revisionism in Switzerland

Dissident German Historian Imprisoned

No Evidence for Gas Chambers, Says French Historian

Robert Faurisson

Revisionists Meet in Australia

Pope Pius XII and the Jews

Arthur R. Butz

— Review —

Stalin's Plan to Conquer Europe

Daniel W. Michaels

— And More —

Apocalypse 1945: The Destruction of Dresden

Mass killing and terrorism were the sole objectives of the horrific February 1945 Allied air attack on Dresden, which British diplomat and author Harold Nicolson called "the single greatest holocaust by war."

One of Europe's great cultural and architectural treasures, the undefended German city had no importance as a military target. Winston Churchill chose it as the target for a spectacular "shattering blow" to smash German civilian morale. Some 2,000 British and American bombers took part in the devastating raid on a city packed with hundreds of thousands of women and children fleeing advancing Soviet forces.

Here is the full story — from the perspectives of both perpetrators and victims — of the criminal raid that took the lives of many tens of thousands, the great majority of them civilians.

Originally serialized in the London Sunday Telegraph, this is the best-selling book that launched David Irving's career as a world-renowned historian.

With many rare wartime photographs, this thoroughly revised and updated edition is based on more than three decades of research.

Apocalypse 1945: The Destruction of Dresden
by David Irving

Hardcover. Dust jacket. 325 pages. Photos. Source notes. Index. (0807)
$25.00, plus shipping ($2.50 domestic).

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA

Editor: Mark Weber

Associate Editor: Greg Raven

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Advisors are not spokesmen of
the educational institutions identified.

GEORGE ASHLEY, Ph.D
Los Angeles Unified School District (ret.)

ENRIQUE AYNAT, L.L.B.
Torreblanca, Spain

PHILIP BARKER, Ph.D
Minneapolis, Minnesota

JOHN BENNETT, L.L.B.
Australian Civil Liberties Union
Melbourne, Australia

ALEXANDER V. BERKIS, L.L.M., Ph.D.
Professor of History (ret.)
Longwood College
Farmville, Virginia

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Electrical
and Computer Engineering
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

BOYD CATHEY, Ph.D.
The Southern Partisan
Columbia, South Carolina

ROBERT H. COUNTESS, Ph.D.
Huntsville, Alabama

ALBERT J. ECKSTEIN, Ph.D.
Santa Fe Springs, California

ROBERT FAURISSON, Ph.D.
Professor of French Literature (ret.)
University of Lyon-2
Lyon, France

GEORG FRANZ-WILLING, Ph.D.
Überlingen, Germany

JÜRGEN GRAF
Basel, Switzerland

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
The Agorist Institute
Beverly Hills, California

R. CLARENCE LANG, Ph.D., M. Div.
Seguin, Texas

JAMES MARTIN, Ph.D.
Professor of History (ret.)
Colorado Springs, Colorado

CARLO MATTOGNO
Rome, Italy

HIDEO MIKI
Professor of History (ret.)
National Defense Academy
Yokosuka, Japan

OLEG PLATONOV, Ph.D.
Moscow, Russia

HENRI ROQUES, Ph.D.
Colombes, France

WILHELM STÄGLICH, Dr. Jur.
Glücksburg, Germany

UDO WALENDY, Diplo. Pol.
Vlotho/Weser, Germany

CHARLES E. WEBER, Ph.D.
Head, Dept. of Modern Languages (ret.)
University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma

C. ZAVERDINOS, Ph.D.
Pietermaritzburg, South Africa

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume 17, Number 4 July / August 1998

In This Issue

Swiss Court Punishes Two Revisionists 2

Holocaust Skeptics Under Growing Attack in Switzerland 11

A Dangerous Guilt Complex 12

Switzerland's Anti-Racism Law 13

Dissident German Historian Punished for Revisionist Writings 14

Polish Authorities Ban BBC and David Irving from Auschwitz 16

IHR Internet Web Site 17

Revisionists Meet in Australia 18
Arthur R. Butz

Pope Pius XII and the Jews 20
Arthur R. Butz

Jewish Group Demands More Anti-Revisionist Laws 22

Revisionist Activism in Sweden 22

Widespread Holocaust Doubts in Sweden 23

A Historian Acknowledges: No Evidence for Nazi Gas Chambers 24
Robert Faurisson

Promoting Holocaust Hatred of Germans 28

Stalin's Plan to Conquer Europe: Suvorov's *The Last Republic* 30
A review by Daniel W. Michaels

Letters 39

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) began publication in 1980. It upholds and continues the tradition of Historical Revisionism of scholars such as Harry Elmer Barnes, A.J.P. Taylor, William H. Chamberlin, Paul Rassinier and Charles Tansill. *The Journal of Historical Review* is published six times yearly by the **Institute for Historical Review,** P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659. Subscription price: $40 per year, $65 for two years, and $90 for three years. For foreign subscriptions, add $10 per year. For overseas airmail delivery, add $30 per year. Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in US dollars drawable on a US bank. Donations to the IHR are tax-deductible.

Single copies of most *Journal* issues published since Spring 1986 (Volume 7) are available for $7.50 each, plus $2.00 shipping. Ask about the availability of specific issues. Hardbound annual volumes of the *Journal* for the years 1984, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993 are also available for $35.00 each, plus $3.50 shipping. Write for our booklist and prices.

Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the Editor. They should be double-spaced and accompanied by return postage. Especially welcome are submissions on diskette. Send all correspondence to **P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659**. E-mail to: ihr@ihr.org. Web site: http://www.ihr.org.

The Journal of Historical Review is listed in standard periodical directories. Contributions do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute for Historical Review.

All rights reserved. Except for specifically copyrighted items, permission is hereby given to reprint material from this issue of the *Journal*, provided that no changes or alterations are made without prior arrangement, and providing that the following attribution appears with the material: "Reprinted from *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA. Subscriptions: $40 per year (domestic)." A copy of the reprint should be sent to the Editor.

Prosecutor Threatens Defense Witness

Swiss Court Punishes Two Revisionists

Author Jürgen Graf Fined, Sentenced to 15 Months in Prison

A court in Switzerland has punished 47-year-old teacher Jürgen Graf and 78-year-old retired engineer Gerhard Förster with fines and prison terms for writing or publishing allegedly anti-Jewish books.

A district court in the northern Swiss town of Baden on July 21 sentenced Graf, a leading Holocaust revisionist, to 15 months imprisonment for writing several dissident works on the wartime treatment of Europe's Jews, and Förster to 12 months in prison for publishing several allegedly anti-Jewish books, including two by Graf. In addition, each was fined 8,000 Swiss francs ($5,500). The court also ordered the two Swiss citizens to turn over 55,000 francs (about $38,000) earned from book sales, with Förster to pay 45,000 and Graf 10,000.

Graf must also pay 1,000 francs to a Basel theology professor as compensation or atonement for having mailed him a copy of one of his books with an allegedly offensive inscription. The court also ordered the confiscation and destruction of a long list of books and booklets. As a consequence of his conviction and sentencing, Graf was fired in early August from his position as a teacher at a private school.

With the verdict now on appeal, Graf and Förster are still free men. It's unlikely that the appeals court will consider the case before January 1999, and even if it upholds the verdict, the case may still go to Switzerland's highest court (*Bundesgericht*).

The Graf/Förster case is by far the most important so far on the basis of Switzerland's new "Anti-Racism Law," which came into effect on January 1, 1995. During the one-day trial, held on July 16, Graf eloquently defended his skeptical views on the Holocaust story. Similarly, each of the two defense attorneys ably represented his client with vigor, skill and intelligence.

The Baden court found that Graf had violated the law as the author of four books, *Der Holocaust auf dem Prüfstand* ("The Holocaust on the Test Stand"), *Der Holocaust Schwindel* ("The Holocaust Swindle"), *Auschwitz: Tätergeständnisse und Augenzeugen des Holocaust* ("Auschwitz: Confessions and Witnesses of the Holocaust"), and *Todesursache Zeitgeschichtsforschung* ("Cause of Death: Contemporary History Research"), as well as a booklet, *Das Rotbuch: Vom Untergang der Schweizerischen Freiheit* ("The Red Book: On the Decline of Swiss Freedom").

Graf was further found guilty of having mailed computer diskettes containing several of his "racist" texts to Ahmed Rami in Sweden and to Ernst Zündel in Canada, who then posted them on the Internet.

Förster was found guilty of having published allegedly anti-Jewish writings by Graf and two other authors.

In explaining the court's severe punishment, Presiding Judge Andrea Staubli cited the defendants' "remarkable criminal energy," and said that their lack of remorse contributed to the decision not to hand down suspended sentences. The five members of the court, three women and two men, were unanimous in their verdict.

Judge Andrea Staubli rejected defendants' arguments that the "criminal" books were scholarly: she characterized them as cynical and inhuman. The court also rejected the argument that Graf should not be punished for at least one of the "offending" books because it was written before January 1, 1995, when the law under which they were being tried came into effect.

As the trial began at eight o'clock on the morning of July 16, all 60 seats in the court room were already occupied, mostly by supporters of Graf and Förster. Some of the sympathizers had traveled from French-speaking western Switzerland, and even from outside the country.

Graf's court-appointed defense attorney, Dr. Urs Oswald, lost no time in calling on the court to quash the case because law under which the defendants had been brought to trial violated the European Human Rights Convention. Even the defense attorneys in this case, he pointed out, risked being punished if they try to show to the court that their clients' views are based on fact. As expected, the court rejected Oswald's motion.

He then asked the court to permit testimony on behalf of the defendants by two witnesses: well-known French revisionist scholar Dr. Robert Faurisson, and Austrian engineer Wolfgang Fröhlich. The

court rejected Dr. Faurisson (perhaps because the court and the prosecutor were familiar with him), but agreed to permit Fröhlich to testify (perhaps because they were not familiar with him).

Engineer Fröhlich's Testimony

In his brief introductory remarks to the court, Wolfgang Fröhlich noted that his special fields of expertise are process engineering and gas applications. He told the court that he has carried out numerous gassings to exterminate pests and infectious microbes.

Presiding Judge Staubli warned Fröhlich that any false testimony would be punished with imprisonment. She then asked the engineer if, in his opinion, Graf's books were scholarly in character. Fröhlich replied that he is not able to judge their scholarship as works of history, because he is not a historian. However, with respect to their treatments of technical aspects of the alleged mass exterminations, he affirmed that Graf's statements are absolutely sound.

At this point, public prosecutor Aufdenblatten asked the presiding judge to once again remind Fröhlich of his obligation to provide truthful testimony. She did so, and thereafter the following exchange took place (as recorded verbatim by persons attending the trial):

> Aufdenblatten: "In your opinion were mass gassings with Zyklon B technically possible?"
>
> Fröhlich: "No."
>
> Aufdenblatten: "Why not?"
>
> Fröhlich: "The pesticide Zyklon B is hydrocyanic acid absorbed in a granular-shaped carrier substance. It is released through contact with the air. The evaporation point of hydrocyanic acid is 25.7 degrees [Celsius]. The higher the temperature, the more rapid is the rate of evaporation. The delousing chambers in which Zyklon B was used in NS [German wartime] camps and elsewhere were heated to 30 degrees and higher, so that the hydrocyanic acid would be released rapidly from the carrier granules. However, in the half-underground mortuaries of the Auschwitz-Birkenau crematories, where witnesses claim that mass killings with Zyklon B took place, the temperatures were very much lower. Even if one allows for the warming of the spaces by the body warmth of the hypothetical prisoners, the temperature would not have been more than 15 degrees, even in summer time. Consequently, it would have taken many hours for the hydrocyanic acid to evaporate.
>
> "According to eyewitness reports, the victims died very quickly. The witnesses mention time frames of 'instantaneous' to '15 minutes.' To be able to kill the gas chamber prisoners in such a short time, the Germans would have had to use ridiculously large amounts of Zyklon — I estimate from 40 to 50 kilograms for each gassing. This would have made any work in the gas chamber fundamentally impossible. The special detachment [*Sonderkommando*] people, whom the witnesses say were assigned the task of clearing out [dead bodies] from them [the gas chambers], would have collapsed immediately upon entering the rooms, even if they were wearing gas masks. Enormous amounts of hydrocyanic acid would have streamed out into the open, and would have poisoned the entire camp."

Jürgen Graf addresses the Twelfth IHR Conference, September 1994.

Fröhlich's statement, which was greeted with applause by many of those in the court room, is entirely in keeping with findings of other specialists. His testimony strengthens and corroborates the investigations and declarations of such specialists as American gas chamber expert Fred Leuchter, Austrian engineer Walter Lüftl, American research chemist William B. Lindsay, German chemist Germar Rudolf, and German engineer Wolfgang

Schuster. (See the Winter 1992-93 *Journal*, esp. pp. 391-420, 427, 428.)

Intimidation

Immediately following Fröhlich's statement, public prosecutor Aufdenblatten said: "I hereby ask the court to bring charges against you for racial discrimination, on the basis of Article 261 [the Anti-Racism Law] or otherwise I'll do it myself."

At this point Förster's defense attorney, Jürg Stehrenberger, arose to inform the court that in view of this intolerable intimidation of the witness, he would withdraw from the case. Together with Graf's attorney, he left the courtroom for several minutes. When they returned, the two attorneys expressed their vehement objection to the to the prosecutor's behavior, but announced that they would nevertheless continue their duties as defense attorneys.

In threatening punitive legal action against the witness, the prosecutor not only revealed his lack of regard for truth or justice, but himself committed the punishable offense of attempting to intimidate a witness.

Förster's Testimony

Co-defendant Gerhard Förster, 78 years old, suffers from osteoperosis and other illnesses. He is in such poor health that he had to be brought into the courtroom in a wheel chair. He was born in Silesia, Germany, and served briefly during the Second World War as a private in the regular German army. His father perished, along with some two million others, in the genocidal flight and expulsion of some 12-14 million ethnic Germans from central and eastern Europe, 1944-1946.

Gerhard Förster moved from Germany to Switzerland in 1967, and has been a Swiss citizen for many years. He is a certified electrical engineer who holds several dozen patents. He is a widower.

With an obviously deficient memory, the elderly man easily became confused as he testified, mixed up dates, and was unable to answer some questions clearly. All the same, he did acknowledge to the court his role as business director of the Neue Visionen Verlag (Postfach, 5436 Würenlos, Switzerland), which published three of Graf's allegedly dangerous books.

Graf's Testimony

The contrast between the testimony of Förster and Graf could hardly have been more striking. Unlike Förster, Jürgen Graf was energetic, articulate and unrepentant in defending the views and arguments presented in his books. His testimony, including cross examination, lasted well over two hours.

Although presiding judge Staubli repeatedly asked Graf to speak more slowly or to shorten his responses, she did permit him to present his views and fully develop his arguments. She also kept the proceedings focused on the critical issues at dispute, and away from such extraneous matters as the defendants' political views.

In response to judge Staubli's question as to whether there had actually been a Holocaust or not, Graf said:

> "It's a question of definition. If, by 'Holocaust,' you mean a brutal persecution of the Jews, mass deportations to camps, and the deaths of very many Jews by disease, exhaustion and malnutrition, then this is of course a historical fact. But the Greek term 'holocaust' means 'completely burned' or 'fire sacrifice,' and is used by orthodox historians for the alleged mass gassing and incineration of Jews in 'extermination camps.' That is a myth."

Staubli: "Do you consider yourself a revisionist? What does that expression mean?"

Graf: "Yes, I consider myself a revisionist. In general, the term is applied to historians who subject the official historical account to critical examination. Holocaust revisionism, which is what we are concerned with here, contests three central points: first, the existence of a plan for the physical extermination of the Jews; second, the existence of extermination camps and execution gas chambers; and, third, the figure of five to six million Jewish victims. We cannot know the exact number of victims because the documentation is inadequate. Personally, I estimate probably one million."

Staubli: "Are you a trained historian?"

Graf: "No. But I draw your attention to the fact that both of the most renowned representatives of orthodox 'Holocaust' literature, the Jews Gerald Reitlinger and Raul Hilberg, likewise are not (or were not) trained historians. Reitlinger was a specialist of art history, and Hilberg is a jurist [actually, a political scientist]. The Frenchman Jean-Claude Pressac, who is praised in the media as one who has discredited revisionism, is a pharmacist. If an art historian, a jurist and a pharmacist has the right to express his views on the Holocaust, certainly a philologist has the same right."

Staubli: "What is your motive for writing such [revisionist] books?"

Graf: "My main motive is not to defend the German people, even though I like the Germans. My main motive is a love of the truth. I can't stand lying."

Staubli: "How do you define the term 'scholarship'?"

Graf: "The characteristic feature of scholarship is that all counter arguments are first taken into account and tested before one formulates his own thesis. Revisionists do that."

Staubli: "Would you characterize your own books as scholarly?"

Graf: "I would divide them into three categories. 'Auschwitz: Confessions and Witnesses of the Holocaust,' as well as the book on Majdanek I wrote together with Mattogno, which will be published soon, are scholarly books. 'The Holocaust Swindle' and 'The Holocaust on the Test Stand' I would call popular-scholarly. In these books, I do not so much present my own findings, but for the most part present the findings of revisionists in general. And, finally, 'Cause of Death: Contemporary History Research' is quite simply a novel, and as such is of course not scholarly."

Staubli: "What induced you to write your Auschwitz book?"

Graf: "For the alleged mass gassings in Auschwitz there is neither solid evidence nor documentation, only witness testimony. I got the idea to compile, cite, and analyze the most important of these witness accounts ..."

Staubli: "Do you consider that witness testimony is not credible?"

Graf: "Yes. Let us assume that three witnesses describe an alleged automobile accident. The first testifies that the car left the road, caught fire, and exploded. The second witness states that the car collided with another oncoming car. The third claims that the car was crossing over a bridge that collapsed, throwing the car into the river. What would you make of that? And what would you think if no auto wreck was to be seen anywhere nearby [the site of the alleged accident], and that there was no river or bridge?

"The eyewitness testimonies of gassings contradict each other on every conceivable point. And when they do agree, they always contain the same impossibilities that rob them of all credibility. For example, many witnesses testify that three bodies were incinerated in a single oven in 15 minutes. In fact, the capacity is one body per oven per hour. The number cited by the witnesses is therefore exaggerated by a factor of twelve ..."

Staubli: "In the introduction to your Auschwitz book you write that there is no documentary proof for the extermination of Jews in the camps. Do you stand by this testimony?"

Graf: "Of course. The anti-revisionist French historian Jacques Baynac wrote in [the Swiss newspaper] *Nouveau Quotidien* of September 3, 1996, that a lack of evidence makes it impossible to prove the existence of the gas chambers. In 1995 Mattogno and I spent nearly two months in two Moscow archives, where we perused 88,000 pages of Auschwitz documents and thousands of pages of documents from other camps. Not one single document provides proof of the gassing of a single Jew. This did not surprise us, because if such documents existed, the Communists would have triumphantly displayed them to the world in 1945. But no, the documents vanished for 46 years and have only been accessible to researchers since 1991. Why?

"The German documents show very clearly what the National Socialist Jewish policy called for. They wanted to get the Jews out of Europe and, during the war, to exploit their labor."

Staubli: "You write in 'The Holocaust Swindle' that 'after the war the Jews were still there.' What do you mean by that?"

Graf: "I mean that most of the Jews in the area controlled by Germany survived. Rolf Bloch, President of the Holocaust Fund, said in the *Handelszeitung* of February 4, 1998, that there are still more than a million Holocaust survivors alive today. Any insurance statistician can calculate for you that in the Spring of 1945 there must have been more than three million alive. As Walter Sanning proved in his study *The Dissolution [of Eastern European Jewry]*, published in 1983 and based almost exclusively on Jewish sources, that at the most four million Jews lived in the area under German control at its greatest extent. Of these, as we have shown, more than three million survived. How can

anyone arrive at a figure of six million victims?

Staubli: "Can't you imagine that Jews feel offended by your books?"

Graf: "Yes, and many non-Jews as well. The brain-washing has been so thorough that anyone who inadvertently stumbles upon the truth would be completely upset."

Staubli: "And don't you care if Jews feel offended by your books?"

Graf: "Edgar Bronfman said recently that Switzerland is like a man who has to have his feet held in the fire before he sees reason. Can't you imagine that a Swiss person would feel offended by that? Why is it that only Jewish feelings are taken into account, and never the feelings of non-Jews?"

Staubli: "The Anti-Racism Law was affirmed through a democratic referendum. Shouldn't you respect that?"

Graf: "At the time the people were led to believe that the law serves to protect foreigners against racist violence. In reality it serves exclusively to protect Jews against all criticism. This is irrefutably proven in the booklet *Abschied vom Rechtsstaat* ('Departure from the State of Law'), to which I contributed two short essays. So far not a single Swiss citizen has been indicted or convicted because he criticized a black man, an Arab, or a Turk. Only persons who have criticized Jews have been indicted and convicted."

Staubli: "Did the action you depicted in 'Cause of Death: Contemporary History Research,' the discussion in a German secondary school class, really take place?"

Graf: "The action was, of course, invented."

Staubli: "But in your introduction you represent it as if it actually took place."

Graf: "That's a familiar old literary ploy. Many authors of novels write that they have discovered an old manuscript or found a message in a bottle."

Staubli: "In this book the pupil Marietta says that if the Germans had had more Zyklon available, fewer prisoners would have died. Justify that statement!"

Graf: "The main reason for the extremely high mortality in Auschwitz was typhus, which is carried by lice. In late Summer 1942 this pestilence accounted for 403 deaths on a single day. The documents show that the Germans repeatedly requested Zyklon B to eliminate the lice, because the supplies were inadequate. Thus, Marietta's statement is nothing less than a provable historical fact. Incidentally, I bring your attention to the fact that during the war Zyklon B was also delivered to Switzerland, Norway and Finland. Does that mean that Jews were gassed in those countries as well?"

Staubli: "In the booklet [*Rotbuch*] 'On the Decline of Swiss Freedom' you write that the Holocaust has become a religion for the Jews. Do you want to comment on that?"

Graf: "It is estimated that today one in three Jews no longer believes in God, but they all believe in the gas chambers. Belief in the Holocaust is today the glue that holds the Jews together."

Staubli: "In the same booklet is the sentence: 'The march toward a police state has begun.' Why do you speak of a march toward a police state?"

Graf: "If a total police state already existed, I would be in jail or dead, and would be unable to speak freely here today. We still are able to protest. If things develop as they are now going, in five years we will no longer have that possibility."

Graf characterized the legal proceeding against Förster and himself as a "classic political trial." The defendants are on trial here not because of anything they've done, but rather because of their opinions. The suppression of dissident opinions through the penal code, he said, is the classic feature of a dictatorship.

The Prosecutor Sums Up

In his concluding address to the court, public prosecutor Aufdenblatten did not even try to establish a connection between the incriminating passages in the books published by Förster and the wording of Switzerland's Anti-Racism Law. Instead, he resorted to emotion-charged phrases such as "pseudo-scholarly," "anti-semitic incitement," and "racist propaganda." Because Graf is highly intelligent, the prosecutor went on, he is doubly dangerous. Graf was not seeking the truth, but rather consciously distorting it. His writings fanned the

flames of anti-Semitism and hatred of foreigners.

Because Graf showed no remorse, and even reaffirmed his revisionist views before the court, the prosecutor said, he is not likely to mend his ways. Therefore the court should not consider handing down a suspended sentence against him. The same is true of Förster, the prosecutor went on, who has been just as unreasonable as Graf. Förster's poor health is no reason to be lenient. If he's too ill to actually serve a prison term, that's something for a physician to decide, not the court.

Förster's Attorney Speaks

In his concluding address to the court, Förster's attorney Jürg Stehrenberger spoke quickly and with conviction. He began by emphasizing the special difficulties involved in defending his client in this case, noting that by merely discussing the testimonies of the defendants and the defense witness he runs the risk of himself violating Swiss law.

The Court was not competent to judge what happened 50 years ago, he continued, but only what one writes today. The Anti-Racism Law violates basic constitutional rights, such as the freedom to express one's opinion, freedom of scholarship, and freedom of the press. Moreover, and as even recognized legal specialists have acknowledged, this new law is vaguely or imprecisely worded. And when there is such ambiguity, the court must give the benefit of the doubt to the defendant, and find on his behalf.

The Anti-Racism Law, Stehrenberger continued, specifically states that to violate this law one must "systematically disparage or slander members of a race, ethnic group, or religion." But no such systematic disparagement is to be found in the books written by Graf or published by Förster.

The Anti-Racism Law specifically refers to "denial" of genocide. However, to deny means to contest against one's better knowledge. Therefore, said Stehrenberger, a person who "denies" genocide out of sincere conviction, even if this conviction is subjective, should not be punished, as even a well-recognized legal specialist has acknowledged.

The law's notion of "flagrant whitewashing" or "gross trivializing" (*"gröblich verharmlost"*) poses additional difficulties, Stehrenberger continued. As an authoritative specialist on the criminal code has commented, human suffering cannot be measured, and therefore the number of victims is essentially irrelevant in determining the crime of genocide. Today, however, anyone who estimates the number of Holocaust victims lower than the commonly accepted Six Million figure is subject to criminal prosecution. There is an inherent contradiction here.

As Stehrenberger noted, anti-revisionist historian Jean-Claude Pressac estimated in the 1994 German edition of his book on "The Crematories of Auschwitz" that the total number of Jewish victims at Auschwitz was between 630,000 and 710,000. (See R. Faurisson's commentary in the Jan.-Feb. 1995 *Journal*, p. 24.) On this basis, even a prominent anti-revisionist such as Pressac could conceivably be prosecuted under Swiss law for "whitewashing" genocide.

Because of the highly-publicized campaign currently being carried out by Jewish organizations against Switzerland and Swiss banks, Stehrenberger further noted, there is considerable public interest in determining just what Swiss officials knew, and did not know, during the Second World War about the fate of the Jews under German control.

In this regard, he spoke of the inspection visit to the Auschwitz concentration camp by Rossel and other delegates of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) on September 29, 1944. How does one explain, he asked, that in their report on this visit, the ICRC delegation stated that they found no confirmation of the rumors of human gassings, and that the prisoners questioned did not mention them? (See *Documents relating to the work of the International Committee of the Red Cross for the benefit of civilian detainees in German Concentration Camps between 1939 and 1945* [Geneva: ICRC, 1975], pp. 76-77. French-language ed., Geneva, June 1946, p. 92.)

No one, Stehrenberger pointed out, not even the public prosecutor, has ever claimed that Graf either falsely cited or translated any of the eyewitness testimonies dealt with in his "Auschwitz: Confessions" book. Furthermore, he pointed out, in October 1994 Förster specifically provided the Swiss Federal Prosecutor's Office with a copy of this book. It is simply incomprehensible, Stehrenberger went on, that if this book was really "criminal," this agency did not react to it, in spite of numerous queries, and six months later declared itself unable to determine if this book is legal or not. In any case, this shows that the Federal Prosecutor's office itself, at least initially, did not regard this book as violating the law.

Stehrenberger went on note that the public prosecutor had dismissed Graf's book out of hand, and without good reason, as "pseudo-scholarly." This is simply unacceptable. In the case of Graf's fictional work, "Cause of Death," the imaginary school class referred to numerous historical works, with the sources always clearly cited. To have included such source references in a fictional literary work on a topic of contemporary history is not offensive.

Stehrenberger also told the court that his client has already been tried and found guilty by the media. During the Second World War Gerhard Förster served for just six weeks on the front as a

Wehrmacht private, but the Swiss press promoted him to the rank of SS officer, and repeatedly castigated him as a "Nazi." Because of his German origin, he was considered free game for bigoted "anti-racists."

Stehrenberger concluded by asking the court to exonerate and acquit his client.

Graf's Attorney Sums Up

In his concluding address to the court, Graf's attorney spoke for more than an hour. Dr. Oswald repeatedly assailed the public prosecutor's arguments, and rejected the indictment as carelessly drawn up and completely indefensible.

For one thing, said Oswald, the books by Graf that were written before the Anti-Racism Law came into effect on January 1, 1995, should never have been the subject of an indictment at all. For this reason he hadn't even bothered to deal with the contents of these writings. Graf's "Auschwitz" book, for example, was indisputably written in May 1994 and published in August of the same year. To prosecute someone for books that were written before the law under which he is indicted even came into effect is a violation of the ancient legal principle of *Nulla poena sine lege*, "without a law, no crime." (This principle is also expressed in the American constitutional prohibition against "ex post facto" laws.)

Neither the prosecutor nor anyone else has ever claimed that Graf himself had marketed his "Auschwitz" book. The prosecutor's argument that Graf was liable because he had not forbidden the book's distribution after January 1, 1995, but had expressly agreed to its further distribution, is pathetic and violates basic legal norms.

Even the fact that Graf had continued to sell his two earliest books after the Anti-Racism Law went into effect is not punishable because he had not violated the law's stricture against "public" distribution. Graf had not advertised his books, nor had he distributed them to libraries, where they would have been available to the general public, but rather had sent them only to persons who had specifically ordered them. How, therefore, can anyone speak of the "public" in this case? According to prevailing legal norms, even a closed circle of friends is not considered the general "public," much less a few individuals.

While it is true that Graf's booklet, "On the Decline of Swiss Freedom," was written after the Anti-Racism Law came into effect, the allegedly incriminating passages in this work were taken from his "Auschwitz" book, and were cited by him there in response to critics.

Oswald acknowledged that Graf had sent diskettes containing his revisionist writings to Ahmed Rami in Sweden and Ernst Zündel in Canada, who then posted the texts on the Internet. But this is also not a crime, because the "scene of the crime" in this case was not in Switzerland. Graf's texts have been posted on the Internet in Canada, the United States, and Sweden, where there are no laws against revisionism.

Because any Internet text can be called up in any country, to be consistent with the prosecutor's view of the world every text posted on the Internet would have to conform to the laws of every country in the world. Anyway, Oswald told the court, the provider and not the author should be held legally responsible for deciding which of the texts to post that he may have received.

Graf's motive, Oswald went on, has not been to disparage Jews, but rather to pursue the truth. The prosecuting attorney claims the opposite, without however providing any proof. He made no effort whatsoever to substantiate his accusation of "pseudo-scholarship."

For all these reasons, Oswald summed up, Graf should be acquitted on all counts.

Dr. Oswald's concluding address was received with warm appreciation by the courtroom's sympathetic majority, just as the concluding statement by Förster's attorney had been.

Graf's Concluding Statement

Presiding Judge Staubli offered defendant Graf ten minutes in which to make a final statement, on condition that he limit himself to discussing issues of the trial itself. After agreeing to this, Graf said the following:

> Honorable Madame Presiding Judge, distinguished members of the Court, ladies and gentlemen:
>
> First, permit me two preliminary remarks. I want to thank you, Madame Presiding Judge, for the fair manner and way you have conducted this trial. You've permitted me to speak without hindrance and to defend my theses, and for that I am grateful. I [also] thank my attorney Dr. Oswald for his outstanding [final] address ...
>
> This morning an eminently qualified engineer — a specialist in constructing gas chambers for pest control and for exterminating microbes — testified as a witness for the defense. Wolfgang Fröhlich was explicitly instructed on his duty to testify truthfully, and he acknowledged this responsibility. Public prosecutor Aufdenblatten asked him if mass killings of human beings by means of Zyklon B in gas chambers, as has been described by witnesses, were possible, and if not, why not. On the basis of his profound technical knowledge,

and faithful to his duty to provide truthful testimony, Fröhlich answered "no" to the question, and he then substantiated his response.

And how did the public prosecutor respond? He proposed criminal charges against him. That, ladies and gentlemen, is pure Stalinism! I know that this is a serious accusation, but I stand by it. As much as you, Madame Presiding Judge, have striven for a fair trial, the public prosecutor has not.

Permit me to say a few words about myself, although I don't like to focus attention on myself. I have knowingly exchanged a secure and well paid position in a state school for an uncertain future. From the outset, I've anticipated facing a trial. I'm surprised that it's taken this long. And then the public prosecutor presumes to read my mind, claiming that I don't really seek the truth, but rather lies. Do you believe that anyone would willingly risk ruining his career for an obvious lie?

We revisionists try hard to get as close to the historical truth as we can. We like nothing more than to have our mistakes pointed out to us. Indeed, there are some mistakes in my books. But do you know who brought them to my attention? Other revisionists! From the other side the only reactions have been insults, smears, threats, legal actions, and trials.

Their absolute helplessness in the face of revisionist arguments was just as glaringly obvious in the statements of the public prosecutor... Not a single argument, but rather only phrases such as "pseudo-scholarship," "anti-Semitism," "racist incitement," and so forth.

[Jewish community leader] Sigi Feigel and his people want to put Förster and me behind bars, and to ban our books. I don't want Sigi Feigel locked up, and if he should manage one day to write a book, I wouldn't want it banned. I invite Mr. Feigel ... or any other representative of the official Holocaust school, to a factual, non-polemical, open discussion of this issue on radio or television. The two major topics of this discussion would be the question of the existence of gas chambers and the number of Jewish victims of National Socialist policies.

As far back as any human being can remember, no Swiss man or women has been imprisoned for the non-violent expression of his or her opinion. The last such case was early in the last century. Do you, ladies and gentlemen of the court, at the dawn of the 21st century, want to break this tradition? And if you insist on jailing one of us, then please lock me up and not Mr. Förster, who is deathly ill!

You would not shame me by imprisoning me. By doing so, you would shame our country, Switzerland. A Switzerland in which freedom of expression is being abolished, a Switzerland in which a minority of 0.6 percent of the population is permitted to decide who reads, writes, says or thinks what, is dead.

I would like to close my comments by citing my friend in western Switzerland, Gaston-Armand Amaudruz, against whom a trial is being prepared in Lausanne that is similar to the one here today against Förster and me. In issue number 371 of his *Courrier du Continent* newsletter, Amaudruz writes: "As once in early historical times, it is sign of weakness to try to impose a dogma by force. The exterminationists may win trials through laws that muzzle freedom of speech. But they will lose the final trial before the court of future generations.

A Courageous and Able Scholar

Jürgen Graf says that he was not surprised by the court's harsh verdict. Last year, in fact, he had predicted that he and Förster would be found guilty and sentenced.

As one of the most internationally prominent revisionist scholars, Graf has been targeted by Jewish organizations for several years now as a particularly notorious "Holocaust denier." In March 1993, following the publication of his 112-page book, "The Holocaust on the Test Stand," he was summarily dismissed from his post as a secondary school teacher of Latin and French. (See "Swiss Teacher Suspended for Holocaust Book," Sept.-Oct. 1993 *Journal*, pp. 36-37.)

Graf, born in 1951, is a meticulous scholar and researcher with an impressive command of languages, including Russian, modern Greek, Mandarin Chinese, and the Scandinavian languages. He makes his home near Basel.

His "Holocaust on the Test Stand" book has appeared in French, Spanish, Dutch, Bulgarian, Italian and Arabic editions. In December 1994 the French-language edition, *L'Holocauste au scanner*, was banned in France by order of the country's Interior Ministry. Some 200,000 copies of an expanded edition of this work have been published and distributed in Russia under the title "The Myth of the Holocaust." (See "A Major Revisionist Breakthrough in Russia," July-August 1997 *Journal*, pp. 36-37.)

Through the Internet "world wide web," a number of Graf's writings are accessible to millions around the world.

Graf has worked together with other revisionist scholars, including Robert Faurisson and Carlo Mattogno. Graf and Mattogno have made four research visits together to Russia, eastern Europe and the Netherlands, including detailed investiga-

tion of documents in Moscow archives. (See the report in the Nov.-Dec. 1995 *Journal*, pp. 36-37.)

Graf spoke at the Twelfth Conference of the Institute for Historical Review Conference, held in southern California in September 1994. (An adaptation of his address was published in the Nov.-Dec. 1995 *Journal*, pp. 2-11.) He is also a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee. (See the May-June 1997 *Journal*, p. 20)

Lessons

One journalist who closely followed the Graf/Förster trial and who is familiar with the Middle East expressed the view that the Swiss court had conducted itself much like an Israeli military tribunal judging Palestinians. The prison sentences imposed against Graf and Förster are all the more shameful and ominous because they were handed down in a country with a traditionally high regard for freedom. Commenting on the severity of the sentences, one American writer quipped: "It's lucky that Switzerland is a country with freedom of speech. Imagine how harsh the sentences would be if it wasn't."

Tellingly, no influential American newspaper or magazine has expressed even a word of criticism of the Graf/Förster verdicts or, for that matter, of any of the numerous legal persecutions of revisionists in western Europe. Perhaps this silence betrays embarrassment over the obvious injustice of this assault against free speech and freedom of research.

In a front-page commentary on the Graf/Förster case that reflects "official" opinion the Alpine confederation these days, the daily *Tages-Anzeiger* (July 22) warned that the defendants are not as harmless as they appear. In an effort to justify the verdicts, the large-circulation Swiss paper went on to tell readers:

> Holocaust deniers, with their unspeakable theories, injure the human dignity of the Jews, the memory of the victims, and their history... Their goal is to stir up hatred against the Jews, and their hidden motive is to whitewash the National Socialists and make their dangerous ideology once again acceptable.

One might just as easily argue, and with greater justification, something like the following:

> Jewish-Zionist apologists, with their unspeakable theories, injure the human dignity of non-Jews, and especially Palestinians and Germans, the memory of Israel's victims, and their history ... Their goal is to promote an arrogant contempt for non-Jews, and their hidden motive is to whitewash the Zionists and make their dangerous ideology acceptable.

The plain reality is that in Western society today, Jewish interests and sensitivities are treated, both legally and socially, as more important than those of any other group. This special, superior status is codified in Switzerland's Anti-Racism Law, in similar laws in other European countries, and in the United States' "special relationship" with Israel.

The legal persecution of "Holocaust deniers," as well as the intense, and enormously successful, international Jewish campaign of pressure and blackmail to squeeze money from Switzerland and others countries for their supposed transgressions during the Second World War, clearly reflect immense Jewish power and influence.

The Graf/Förster case, and the legal persecution of "Holocaust deniers" in western Europe generally, point up the important quasi-religious role that the Holocaust story has come to play in contemporary Western society. Accordingly, "Holocaust blasphemy" is treated, and punished, as the most serious "thought crime."

Even if only quietly, resentment and opposition to this obvious injustice is growing. For this reason, it's not surprising that Switzerland's respected weekly paper *Weltwoche* expresses concern (July 23) that the Graf/Förster trial, and others like it, are actually likely to promote even more anti-Jewish sentiment. The supposedly anti-Jewish passages in Graf's books, the weekly paper notes, are "harmless compared to what's being said [across Switzerland] these days, not only in bars and coffee shops, but even in theater lobbies."

— September 6, 1998

Democracy and War

"War, which used to be cruel and magnificent, has now become cruel and squalid. It has all been the fault of democracy and science. From the moment that either of these meddlers and muddlers was allowed to take part in actual fighting, the doom of War was sealed. Instead of a small number of well-trained professionals championing their country's cause with ancient weapons and a beautiful intricacy of archaic movement, we now have entire populations, including even women and children, pitted against each other in brutish extermination, and only a set of blear-eyed clerks left to add up the butcher's bill. From the moment when Democracy was admitted to, or rather forced itself upon, the battlefield, War ceased to be a Gentleman's pursuit."

— Winston Churchill, *My Early Life*, 1930

A Record of Repression in Helvetia

Holocaust Skeptics Under Growing Attack in Switzerland

Jürgen Graf and Gerhard Förster are by no means the first persons in Switzerland to be attacked or punished for their revisionist views. They certainly won't be the last. Indeed, it appears that during the past year Swiss authorities have been cracking down on dissidents with noticeably greater severity.

In 1986 a teacher in Lausanne, Mariette Paschoud, was dismissed from her teaching position following a media smear campaign because she had expressed skeptical views on the Holocaust issue. More recently, because she had asked for a single piece of proof for the existence of gas chambers, Switzerland's highest court solemnly declared in May 1995 that Paschoud disputes "the most serious crime of the National Socialist regime, namely the systematic gassing of Jews in gas chambers."

In November 1986 the Geneva police chief forbid two French revisionists — writer and publisher Pierre Guillaume and author Henri Roques — to hold a news conference in the Swiss city. The two were also banned from speaking publicly in Switzerland for three years.

During the 1970s and 1980s, Dr. Max Wahl, a retired Swiss jurist, came under repeated attack from pressure groups and some of the media for his punchy nationalist and pro-revisionist newsletter, *Eidgenoss*. In October 1991, a Munich court fined him 25,200 marks (about $17,890) for the newsletter. (After 18 years of publication, he closed it down in early 1995.)

In January 1993, Bernhard Schaub (a father of two) was fired without notice from his position as a teacher of history and German at a private school in Zurich because he had expressed doubts about wartime "gassings" of Jews in a book he had written. His 1992 history of German-speaking central Europe, *Adler und Rose*, had also prompted the usual media smears. (See Schaub's essay, "Switzerland in the Grip of the 'Traditional Enemy'," in the July-August 1997 *Journal*, pp. 32-35.)

The first Swiss citizen to be brought before a court for expressing revisionist views was Arthur Vogt, an 80-year-old retired secondary school teacher. The country's first Holocaust revisionism trial was held on May 31, 1997, in the district court of Meilen. A few days later, on June 3, 1997, the court declared Vogt guilty of "racially discriminatory propaganda and repeated racial discrimination," and fined him 20,000 francs (about $15,000). Specifically, he had broken the law by mailing copies of Graf's "Cause of Death" book to seven acquaintances in Germany, and had mailed out copies of a newsletter that included Holocaust revisionist essays he had written.

Arthur Vogt, a retired educator, is the first person to be punished by a Swiss court for expressing dissident views on the Holocaust issue. Here at the 1994 IHR Conference he speaks with Mark Weber about revisionist work in Europe.

In December 1997 publisher Aldo Ferraglia, an Italian citizen, was tried by a court in Vevey for having distributed several revisionist titles, including the anti-Zionist book of French scholar Roger Garaudy, *Les mythes foundateurs de la politique israelienne*. Ferraglia was sentenced to four months imprisonment, and ordered to pay 28,000 francs "atonement" to three Jewish organizations, as well as to pay court costs of 15,075 francs. The court took care to note that the country's new Anti-Racism Law "does not prohibit opinions, but rather only their public expression." The country's leading daily newspaper, the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, devoted not a single word to the Ferraglia trial.

In Zurich the district prosecuting attorney's office has recently asked for an eight month prison sentence against revisionist Andreas J. W. Studer.

Gaston-Armand Amaudruz, a retired foreign language teacher who lives in western Switzerland, has recently been indicted for having circulated revisionist books, and for essays in two issues of his

mimeographed newsletter. Born in 1920, Amaudruz has published *Courrier du Continent* (BP 2428, 1002 Lausanne) since 1946. It has about 500 subscribers, many of them outside the country.

In recent weeks the Swiss Federal Police has been struggling to combat "racism" on the Internet. The *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* reports (July 31) that the effort has been hampered by the technical difficulties inherent in the freewheeling Internet system as well as by legal uncertainties. For one thing, nearly all of the alleged 700 "racist and right wing" Internet web sites are outside of Switzerland, many of them in the United States.

On August 19, 1998, Swiss police arrested and jailed Ernst Indelkofer, publisher of *Recht + Freiheit* ("Justice and Freedom"), a magazine with nearly 4,000 subscribers that has supported freedom of speech for revisionists. On September 18, 1997, the Basel city criminal court handed down a fine of 3,000 francs (as well as a three month prison sentence, which was suspended) against Indelkofer because he had included revisionist passages in three issues of *Recht + Freiheit*. After two weeks in jail, he was released on September 2, 1998.

Among the "offending" passages cited by the court were such banal sentences as the following: "A photograph of corpses [as taken in the just-liberated German camps] actually proves nothing about the time it was taken, nor how it came to be taken, or about the ethnicity [of the victims shown]." Similarly objectionable, the court found, was a reference by Indelkofer to an "alleged systematic mass extermination of the Jews." Also offensive, the court declared, was a mention of a North American television broadcast that provided "revisionist (corrective) information about the Auschwitz Holocaust, and which was therefore countered by Jewish circles."

— September 6, 1998

Remember the Institute in Your Will

If you believe in the Institute for Historical Review and its fight for freedom and truth in history, please remember the IHR in your will or designate the IHR as a beneficiary of your life insurance policy. It can make all the difference.

If you have already mentioned the Institute in your will or life insurance policy, or if you would like further information, please let us know.

Director, IHR
P.O. Box 2739
Newport Beach, CA 92659
USA

A Dangerous Guilt Complex

For the Jews the [Holocaust] story has become an indispensable part of their religious heritage, very much like the plight Israel's children had to endure in Egypt or the destruction of the second temple. For non-Jews as well, the Holocaust has gradually been transformed into a religious myth ... Even the slightest criticism of Jews such as Elie Wiesel or Simon Wiesenthal has become taboo: if you criticize a Jew, you're an anti-Semite. Hitler was also an anti-Semite who, as everybody knows, gassed the Jews. So anybody criticizing Jews paves the way to new gas chambers!

As primitive as it is, this kind of argument is remarkably effective. That's what makes the revisionist struggle so exceptionally difficult: not only must we fight an uphill struggle against media censorship, repression and propaganda, but we must also overcome a kind of religious faith. As history shows, refuting religion with rational arguments is not exactly an easy task. But this struggle must be fought, and because the fate of future generations depends on its outcome, we had better win it. The Holocaust lie has poisoned Europeans and other white people of European descent with a guilt complex that threatens to destroy our self-respect and our will to survive.

For all those engaged in this struggle against an enemy with so much clout and virtually unlimited financial resources, the next few years will hardly be devoid of interest. For revisionists, at least, life is not tedious.

— Jürgen Graf at the Twelfth IHR Conference, September 1994.

Freedom of Expression

"First, if any opinion is compelled to silence, that opinion may, for aught we can certainly know, be true. To deny this is to assume our own infallibility. Secondly, though the silenced opinion be in error, it may, and very commonly does, contain a portion of the truth, and since the general or prevailing opinion on any subject is rarely or never the whole truth, it is only by the collision of adverse opinions that the remainder of the truth has any chance of being supplied. Thirdly, even if the received opinion be not only true, but the whole truth, unless it is suffered to be, and actually is, vigorously and earnestly contested, it will, by most of those who receive it, be held in the manner of a prejudice, with little comprehension or feeling of its rational grounds. And not only this, but, fourthly, the meaning of the doctrine itself will be in danger of being lost, or enfeebled."

— John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*

Switzerland's Anti-Racism Law

For many years Swiss law has prohibited discrimination on the basis of race or national origin, similar to provisions of the 1964 and 1968 federal "civil rights" laws in the United States. But Switzerland's new "anti-racism" law, which is a revision of Article (Section) 261 of the criminal code (*Strafgesetzbuch*), goes far beyond this. It also criminalizes dissident or revisionist scholarship on the fate of Europe's Jews during the Second World War — that is, it bans Holocaust revisionism.

With the backing of the country's leading political parties, the new law was approved by the lower house of the Swiss parliament in December 1992, and by the upper house in March 1993. In a nationwide referendum on September 25, 1994, it was narrowly ratified by 54.6 percent of those who voted. Half of the country's cantons rejected it.

In effect since January 1, 1995, Switzerland's new Anti-Racism Law reads as follows:

> Whoever publicly incites hatred or discrimination against a person or a group of persons on the basis of their race, ethnicity or religion,
>
> or whoever publicly promotes an ideology that systematically disparages or slanders members of a race, ethnic group or religion,
>
> or whoever organizes, supports or participates in a propaganda action with this same goal,
>
> or whoever publicly through word, writing, illustration, gesture, act of violence, or in any other way disparages or discriminates against a person or a group of persons on the basis of their race, ethnicity or religion, in a way that offends their human dignity or, for any one of these reasons, denies, flagrantly whitewashes [*gröblich verharmlost*] or seeks to justify, genocide or other crimes against humanity,
>
> or whoever withholds, on the basis of race, ethnicity or religion, a service or product from a person or a group of persons that is offered to the public at large,
>
> will be punished by [up to three years] imprisonment or a fine.

This law's imprecise or ambiguous wording opens the door to selective, and hence unjust, enforcement. For example, just who or what qualifies as a "racial, ethnic or religious" group? Do the Swiss qualify? Apparently not. In that case, is it therefore legal in Switzerland to disparage or slander the Swiss, but not the Jews?

What constitutes a "crime against humanity"? Does Israel's repressive treatment of Palestinian Christians and Muslims count? And if so, does the new Anti-Racism Law criminalize writings by Jewish or Zionist historians that "seek to justify" Israel's repression of Palestinians?

What, precisely, is "genocide"? Is it "genocide" if two percent of a group is killed, or must it be 20 or 50 or 70 percent? And apart from the wartime treatment of Europe's Jews, just what historical cruelties qualify as "genocidal"? How about the extermination of various native Palestinian peoples by the ancient Israelites, as related in the Bible (see, for example Deuteronomy 20:16-17 and Joshua 10:26-40)? Or how about the dispossession and slaughter of native Indians of North America?

What precisely is "flagrant whitewashing" (or "gross trivializing") of the Holocaust story? If one estimates the number of Jewish Holocaust victims at four million, is that "whitewashing" or "trivializing"? How about one million? Is it "whitewashing" or "trivializing" to contend that German wartime gas chambers were not as important as historians have been claiming? For example, is Harvard historian Daniel Goldhagen guilty of "whitewashing" for having written in *Hitler's Willing Executioners* (p. 523) that "gassing was really epiphenomenal to the Germans' slaughter of Jews."

A particularly ominous feature of the new Anti-Racism Law, as even Switzerland's respected weekly *Weltwoche* acknowledges (July 23), is that under its provisions a witness who testifies in court on behalf of a "Holocaust denier," or an attorney who represents one during a trial, risks indictment, fines and imprisonment for "publicly" expressing revisionist views.

As Jürgen Graf has aptly observed, the threat and intimidation inherent in Switzerland's Anti-Racism Law smacks of the unjust "justice" of Stalinist Russia.

— *M.W.*

Coming Battle

"America's battle is yet to fight; and we, sorrowful though nothing doubting, will wish her strength for it. New Spiritual Pythons, plenty of them, enormous Megatherions, as ugly as were ever born of mud, loom huge and hideous out of the twilight Future on America; and she will have her own agony, and her own victory, but on other terms than she is yet quite aware of."

— Thomas Carlyle

Udo Walendy in Prison

Dissident German Historian Punished for Revisionist Writings

Since October 1997, German historian Udo Walendy has been serving a prison sentence for publishing dissident historical writings on the Holocaust issue. Two German courts have found him guilty of the crime of "popular incitement" for items that had appeared in several issues of the "Historical Facts" booklet series he edits and publishes.

On May 17, 1996, the district court in Bielefeld sentenced Walendy to a 15 month prison term (non-suspended), even though he had no previous criminal record. As routinely happens in such cases in Germany, the court refused to consider any of the technical or scholarly evidence offered by Walendy's attorneys. A year later, on May 6, 1997, a court in Herford imposed an additional sentence of 14 months imprisonment (non-suspended).

In addition, in November 1996 the Dortmund district court fined Walendy 20,000 marks for having twelve copies of *Mein Kampf* in his possession. Without a shred of evidence, the court charged that he planned to distribute these copies of Hitler's autobiographical manifesto, which is banned in Germany. The court went on to declare:

> ... The planned distribution of the books manifests an extreme and therefore particularly dangerous mindset. The books are propaganda for dismantling the constitutional and legal system of the Federal Republic of Germany, and establishing a National Socialist system of injustice ... This must be judged very severely.

A few months earlier, on February 7, 1996, a squad of 20 policemen, some of them armed, raided Walendy's business and residence. Ignoring Germany's "data protection law," they seized office records and computer diskettes, downloaded copies of his computer files, sealed his office safe, and took him away for fingerprinting.

Guilty for What He Didn't Write

Herford court Judge Helmut Knöner found that Walendy had not knowingly published lies, but rather had broken the law by publishing "one-sided" history that did not give sufficient attention to alternative interpretations. Judge Knöner declared to Walendy (as reported in the *Westfalenblatt* newspaper, May 8-9, 1997):

> This [case] is not about what was written — that's not for this court to determine — but rather about what was not written. If you had devoted just a fraction of the same exactitude to high-lighting the other side [of the *Holocaust* issue], you would not have been sentenced. However, your total one-sidedness is precisely the opposite of the scholarly method. You continually suggest to your readers that if this and that point [of official Holocaust history] is not correct, the rest can't quite be true either. In this way, the Holocaust is reduced to the level of an industrial accident.

In its judgment, the Herford court dealt at some length with Walendy's writings, his alleged method of operation and his motivation. Although during the proceedings he did not dispute that Jews had been persecuted and annihilated during the Second World War, the court found that Walendy's publications nonetheless amount to denial or "whitewashing" or "trivializing" (*"verharmlosung"*) of the wartime treatment of Europe's Jews, which under German law constitutes the crime of "popular incitement" (*Volksverhetzung*). Walendy "denies the historically determined fact of the million-fold murder of Jews by the National Socialists," the court declared, "and thus offends every Jew. This attacks the human dignity of each and every Jew ..."

The court also found that Walendy cites, "on a very scholarly-historical basis," quotations and facts that contradict, "in many specific points, the accepted version of German guilt for the Holocaust and other National Socialist crimes." He "seizes on weak points ... and greatly blows them up in order to encourage a feeling of doubt in the reader." The court went on to state:

> In dealing with war crimes of the Allies (American and Russian), the defendant points to numerous specific cases, which he discusses and comments on at length. He thereby gives

> the reader the impression that the Allies were responsible for most of the war crimes of the Second World War, while the portion committed by the Germans is to be considered rather small ...

The court cited a passage in a "Historical Facts" issue in which Walendy reported approvingly on the findings of American gas chamber expert Fred Leuchter, who concluded that the alleged "gas chambers" at Auschwitz could not possibly have been used for killing prisoners, as alleged. "By uncritically repeating the supposed findings of this 'expert," the defendant endorsed them," the court declared.

The court criticized Walendy for reprinting, in "Historical Fact" No. 66, the text of an article from the *Basler Nachrichten* newspaper of June 13, 1946, "How High is the Number of Jewish Victims?" The article, reprinted from what the court acknowledged is "a respected Swiss periodical," thoughtfully discredits the commonly accepted estimate of six million Jewish wartime victims, and instead put the true figure at between one and one and half million.

"In connection with the other articles in issue No. 66," the court went on, the reprinting of this Swiss newspaper article encourages "the uncritical reader only to conclude that there is no solid proof for the systematic persecution and extermination of Jews, given that all figures must be treated with great caution and that, after all, one cannot say which claims are true and which are not."

"In these ["Historical Facts"] issues No. 66 and 68, the defendant attempted to pursue only the goal of denying and whitewashing the historically settled fact of the systematic persecution and extermination of Jews." In the Herford court's view, Walendy's "denial or whitewashing of the genocide of the Jews is meant to disturb the public peace. In this connection, it is not significant whether or not the public peace was in fact disturbed or not ..."

Walendy told the court that to make sure that the text of each forthcoming issue of his "Historical Facts" series conforms to the law, he routinely submitted the manuscript to four attorneys for their expert review. However, the Herford court simply dismissed the legal opinions of the four attorneys as meritless.

Veteran Historian and Publisher

Now 71 years old, and in relatively good health, Udo Walendy is a veteran revisionist historian, author and publisher. In 1956 he earned a "Diplom-Politologe" (Dipl. Pol.) certificate that affirms his specialized study and knowledge. For a time he was employed as a teacher by the German Red Cross.

He is the author of several books, perhaps the best known of which is a detailed revisionist examination of the origins of the Second World War, *Truth for Germany*, which has been available for decades in both German- and English-language editions. (See the March-April 1995 *Journal*, pp. 28-29.) He also translated and published the German-language edition of Dr. Arthur Butz's book, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (which has been banned by German authorities).



Udo Walendy in his office.

Beside books, Walendy's publishing firm has issued a series of popular-scholarly "Historical Facts" booklets. More than 70 issues in this informative, illustrated, magazine-format series have appeared since the mid-1970s. The most recent issues have been published by VHO in Flanders (Postbus 60, B-2600 Berchem 2, Belgium).

In 1979 Walendy addressed the first Conference of the Institute for Historical Review, and since 1980 has been a member of this *Journal*'s Editorial Advisory Committee. In 1988 he testified in the second Zündel "Holocaust trial" in Toronto.

On October 12, 1997, just after his release from a clinic where he had been under medical treatment, three policemen took him to begin serving his prison sentence. Recently he was given the right to leave the penitentiary in Münster, where he has been held, for "weekend visits" with his family. (He can be reached at Postfach 1643, 32590 Vlotho, Germany.)

Walendy's attorney in his legal battle has been Hajo Herrmann, an outstanding Second World War fighter pilot who endured ten years in Soviet prisons and labor camps.

'Thought Crime' in Germany

Walendy is not the only person who is in a German prison for expressing forbidden historical views. Since November 1995, Günter Deckert, a one-time high school teacher, has been serving a 44 month prison term for revisionist statements and activities.

He was given a two year sentence for "popular incitement," "incitement to racial hatred" and "defamation of the memory of the [Jewish] dead," because he had expressed approval of the findings of American gas chamber expert Fred Leuchter regarding the technical-chemical impossibility of gassings at Auschwitz. In June 1996 an additional 20 months was added to his prison term because he had organized a public meeting in September 1990 at which David Irving had spoken, and because he had distributed revisionist books. (For more on the Deckert case, see "Two-Year Prison Sentence for 'Holocaust Denial'," May-June 1995 *Journal*, pp. 40-42, and "Political Leader Punished," July-August 1993 *Journal*, p. 26.)

In October 1994 Germany's parliament sharpened the law against "popular incitement" to make it apply more directly to "Holocaust denial." The new amendment makes it a crime for a person "in a manner that could disturb the public peace, publicly or in a meeting" to "approve, deny or whitewash" genocidal actions "carried out under National Socialist rule." Offenders are liable to fines and up to five years imprisonment. Noteworthy is the fact that German law applies only to the Third Reich regime and era. It does not criminalize "denial" of genocidal actions carried by Communist, Zionist, Democratic or other regimes.

(For more on the legal repression of historical revisionism in Germany, especially with regard to the Institute for Historical Review and it work, see: "German Government Issues Statement on the IHR," Nov.-Dec. 1995 *Journal*, pp. 34-35; "German Authorities 'Index' Two IHR Leaflets," and, "Institute Letter to German Authorities," both in the July-August 1997 *Journal*, pp. 29-31.)

Polish Authorities Ban BBC Team and David Irving from Auschwitz

Auschwitz State Museum authorities have banned a British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) television team and British historian David Irving from visiting the site of the wartime German concentration camp. In a July 15 letter to Irving, Museum official Krystyna Oleksy wrote: "We must advise you that permission will not be given for you to have any access to the Museum including the photographic and document archives. The BBC have been advised of the position."

No reason was given for the ban. "What are they fearful of?" asks Irving, the controversial author of numerous best-selling historical works. "It shows a grave insecurity, a lack of historical detachment. It's like the suspect saying: We don't mind investigators — just don't let in Lieutenant Columbo!"

Last October the BBC invited Irving to help with a television documentary on the suppression of free speech in Europe. Irving readily agreed. He also asked Museum authorities for permission to carry out research in their extensive archive of wartime documents, construction plans and photographs. Arrangements were made to fly Irving to Auschwitz on August 18 for two days of filming.

In a communication of July 20 BBC producer Nicholas Fraser wrote to Irving:

> We've just received notice from the Auschwitz Museum, to the effect that they will not allow you access to the library or to any of the camp grounds. They control every inch of what used to be the Auschwitz complex and it would seem that we would be unable to film with you there. Reluctantly we have decided that we can't go ahead with our original plan. It just isn't possible.
>
> Needless to say I am very sorry about this and I have tried in vain to convince the museum that this is not necessarily a way to promote freedom of speech. However, they are quite adamant and there is nothing I can do.
>
> We propose instead to film with you in London ...

In issuing the ban, the Polish government agency implicitly acknowledges that it has something to hide. As it happens, Krystyna Oleksy herself admitted in early 1995 to a journalist for the prestigious French news magazine *L'Express* that the room shown to tourists as a supposed execution "gas chamber" in its "original state" is a fraud. It

David Irving was in good form as he addressed 140 persons at a meeting, sponsored by the Institute for Historical Review, on March 28, 1998, in Costa Mesa, California. His lecture was entitled "Winston Churchill: Pearl Harbor and Other Wartime Secrets," although the British historian touched on other topics as well. South African scholar Costas Zaverdinos and IHR Director Mark Weber also addressed the spirited meeting.

was actually built after the war under Polish Communist supervision, and, as the magazine reported, "everything" about it is fake. (See "Major French Magazine Acknowledges Auschwitz Gas Chamber Fraud," Jan.-Feb. 1995 *Journal*, pp. 23-34)

It's one thing for western European police and courts to crack down on revisionist historians, who don't have much popular sympathy or public clout. But it's quite another when authorities in Poland impose restrictions on producers of one of the world's most prestigious and influential media services.

In May 1992 a German court fined David Irving 10,000 marks (about $6,000) for publicly saying what *L'Express* and Museum official Oleksy now acknowledge. (See "Irving Protests German Persecution of Holocaust Skeptics," March-April 1995 *Journal*, p. 28) As a consequence of pressure from Jewish organizations, the historian is banned from Germany, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Canada.

In April 1996 New York publisher St. Martin's Press gave in to pressure from Jewish groups and cancelled publication of Irving's biography, *Goebbels: Mastermind of the Third Reich*. Polish editions of two of Irving's works, *Hitler's War* and his more recent biography of Joseph Goebbels, recently have been selling well in the central European nation.

Visit www.ihr.org

IHR Internet Web Site Offers Worldwide Access to Revisionism

On its own Internet web site, **www.ihr.org**, the Institute for Historical Review makes available an impressive selection of IHR material, including dozens of IHR *Journal* articles and reviews. It also includes a listing of every item that has ever appeared in this *Journal*, as well as the complete texts of *The Zionist Terror Network*, "The Leuchter Report," and Kulaszka's encyclopedic work *Did Six Million Really Die?*. New material is added as time permits.

Key words can be located in any of the site's items using a built-in search capability.

Through the IHR web site, revisionist scholarship is instantly available to millions of computer users worldwide, free of censorship by governments or powerful special interest groups. It can be reached 24 hours a day from around the globe through the World Wide Web (WWW), a multimedia Internet service.

In recent weeks the IHR web site has been receiving 700-800 "hits" or "visits" per day.

Journal associate editor Greg Raven maintains and operates this site as its "webmaster." Because it is linked to several other revisionist (and anti-revisionist) web sites, visitors can easily access vast amounts of additional information.

The IHR web site address is
http://www.ihr.org
E-mail messages can be sent to
ihr@ihr.org

Dangerous Reputation

"One of the best ways to get yourself a reputation as a dangerous citizen these days is to go about repeating the very phrases which our founding fathers used in the great struggle for Independence."

— Charles A. Beard (1874-1948)

The 'Adelaide Institute' Conference

Revisionists Meet in Australia

ARTHUR R. BUTZ

A revisionist conference was held August 7-9, 1998, in Adelaide, Australia, and I was happy to be in attendance. I was there on the invitation of the Director of the "Adelaide Institute," Dr. Fredrick Töben, and I gave two short lectures.

Conference participants came from the USA and Europe as well as Australia. In addition, there was a good number of remote participants. Dr. Robert Faurisson and some others sent videos in advance, and were interviewed and questioned by telephone during the conference. Some made written papers available in advance and then were interviewed and questioned by telephone. Some only communicated by telephone. Most of the coverage was specifically of Holocaust revisionism, but some other subjects were treated as well.

Overall, it was an educational and enjoyable affair, and Dr. Töben should be commended for its success.

It is well worth remarking that Faurisson participated on a remote basis because Australia will not issue him a visa on the grounds of "bad character," by which is meant that he has been convicted of a criminal offense in France, namely violation of the infamous Fabius-Gayssot law of 1990, which outlaws contesting "crimes against humanity" as claimed in the 1946 judgment of the main Nuremberg trial! Although there is no such law in Australia, this conviction in France was used as a legal pretext to bar Faurisson. I do not have such a conviction on my record because there is no such law in the USA, but I assured the conference attendees that, apart from legalistic mumbo-jumbo, my character is just as bad.

What follows does not purport to be a complete summary of the conference, but rather only certain highlights that occur to me. Other attendees no doubt have other ideas of the highlights.

Arthur R. Butz

One of the speakers was David Brockschmidt, who lives near Adelaide and who with his wife Vita hosted me in his house during the conference. The story he told, part of which I pass along below, is one of the most interesting of untold stories, and involves some of the most important events of the century.

David Brockschmidt's father Heinrich was a plumber, general contractor and farmer in Germany during the war. He was a business partner of Oskar Schindler, and in fact was the man who organized the move of Jews from the factory in Poland to a new location in Czechoslovakia, as depicted in the Steven Spielberg film "Schindler's List." (Brockschmidt was not mentioned in the film, however.) The "list" of Jews who were moved was not drawn up by Schindler, as represented in the film, but by the camp commandant Amon Goeth, with the help of a Jewish accountant (not depicted in the film). Goeth and the accountant were deep into the rackets that prevailed at the time and under the circumstances, and made those Jews, newly taken out of the labor camp to make the move, pay dearly to get on the list.

For Schindler the motivation for the move was that the German authorities were trying to force him to switch to a less profitable manufacturing activity.

Goeth was arrested for corruption in the famous SS internal investigation led by Konrad Morgen, and was in jail when the war ended, awaiting probable execution. The most famous catch of Morgen's was Karl Koch, commandant of the Buchenwald concentration camp, who was executed.

As a veteran revisionist I understood immedi-

Arthur R. Butz was born and raised in New York City. In 1966 he joined the faculty of Northwestern University (Evanston, Illinois), where he is now Associate Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering. In addition to numerous technical papers, Dr. Butz is the author of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century.*

This article is copyright by A.R. Butz. It is slightly revised from a text that first appeared on August 20, 1998, on Dr. Butz's Web site: http://pubweb.nwu.edu/~abutz

ately that the film scenes, in which Amon Goeth, at breakfast, shoots Jews in the labor camp from his balcony, were just typical Spielberg junk. Brockschmidt said that he had examined the aerial photos of the camp, and had determined that such events would actually have been impossible. The labor camp was higher than Goeth's balcony, and other buildings intervened.

The Jewish women who were diverted to Auschwitz were freed not by a bribe paid by Schindler but by Frau Schindler's girlfriend, who slept with one of the Germans in command.

Like Oskar Schindler, Heinrich Brockschmidt is listed at the Yad Vashem in Jerusalem as a "righteous gentile," not because of the move he facilitated, but because he hid Jews on his farm. David Brockschmidt spent some time in Israel, in 1967 and in the 1970s.

The Swiss revisionist Jürgen Graf, with whom I spent pleasurable hours because he was also accommodated by the Brockschmidts, gave interesting papers on the Majdanek concentration camp and on the current attempts by Jewish groups to extort money from Switzerland. His native country has not rewarded him for this: In July he was convicted under the new Swiss "Anti-Racism Law" that makes denial of genocide a criminal offense.

Graf is convinced that the international Jewish pressure groups, mainly the World Jewish Congress, mounted their all out extortion attack on Switzerland only after the country's new "Anti-Racism Law" guaranteed that any fundamental controversy within Switzerland would be throttled.

Graf's paper on Majdanek was based on recent work done by himself and the Italian revisionist Carlo Mattogno (who did not participate in the conference). That work will be summarized in a book appearing later this year. Graf and Mattogno have made several visits to Eastern Europe, collecting vast numbers of documents. Their work is very basic and has, it appears to me, great potential because they do not appear to be primarily interested in glory or any sensational thesis. For example, Mattogno has recently published in Italian a book on the organization of the Auschwitz "*Zentralbauleitung*" (Central Construction Office). This is the sort of dry factual foundation required for future sensations.

Germar Rudolf, a German chemist now living in England, gave a deeply technical presentation on alleged "gas chambers" at Auschwitz. In 1993 he was sacked from his post at the Max Planck Institute for Solid State Research in Stuttgart, in 1995 was convicted of "*Volksverhetzung*" (sedition), and in 1996 was denied approval of his Ph.D. thesis at the University of Stuttgart, all for daring to investigate technical aspects of the alleged "gas chambers." He participated in the conference on a remote basis because an outstanding German warrant for his arrest makes travel hazardous for him.

Jürgen Graf knows many languages and is a language teacher. While he was in Australia he learned that he had been fired from his teaching job back home on account of his conviction and sentencing. Faurisson is a brilliant academic who has forced the European establishment to resort to hysterical defense of the "Holocaust" legend (the Fabius-Gayssot law is a *Lex Faurisson*, almost a bill of attainder). Graf is a learned gentleman. Rudolf was a young chemist with a bright future.

I wonder about people who can read of their persecution and not express enough outrage to force European countries to rescind their laws restricting free expression, and which could not possibly be laws in the USA. How often do we hear of the international outrage over China's failure to abide by our notions of civil liberties? As I write this, there is much attention being paid to violations of human rights in Myanmar (Burma). The victims of this repression were foreigners intervening in that country's politics, not natives publishing historical studies. Dear reader, how is such hypocrisy possible? Are you guilty?

'Holocaust Pressure Groups Shut Down Japan's *Marco Polo* Magazine,' a 30-page IHR Special Report, is available from the Institute for $20.

This important supplement to the feature article in the March-April 1995 *Journal* includes a translation of Dr. Nishioka's headline-making *Marco Polo* article, facsimile copies of numerous reports from American and Japanese English-language newspapers on the Marco Polo furor, and more.

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739 · Newport Beach, CA · 92659

Pope Pius XII and the Jews

ARTHUR R. BUTZ

The following are what I consider some important points in the behavior of the wartime Pope Pius XII in relation to the Nazi persecutions of the Jews. The rough situation is that, while the Vatican aided Jews, especially Italian Jews, Pius XII was relatively silent about "extermination." My explanation for this silence needs no lengthy elucidation.

Despite the great controversy, the role of Pius XII does need some elucidation. [See also "Pope Pius XII During the Second World War" in the Sept.-Oct. 1993 *Journal*.] This is not intended as a summary of his papacy, or of his wartime behavior, or even as a full treatment of his behavior in relation to the persecutions of the Jews. Rather, the emphasis here is on those facts which I believe receive insufficient attention in contemporary debate on this subject. Much, though not all, of this material appears in Appendix E of my book *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. Much documentation is given there or in other books I cite here, so here only some of the most important sources are given.

Eugenio Pacelli, who was to become Pope Pius XII in 1939, was Papal Nuncio in Germany during the Twenties. In 1930 he returned to Rome as the newly appointed Vatican Secretary of State under Pius XI. There he played an important role in negotiating, with the Hitler government, the 1933 Concordat between the Roman Catholic Church and Germany.

He is also commonly credited with authoring the 1937 papal encyclical *Mit Brennender Sorge*. Released in German rather than the customary Latin, it expressed the deep differences between the Catholic Church and the Nazi movement, which had been developing ever since the Concordat. Youth education was a particularly contentious issue. After Pius XI died early in 1939, Pacelli became Pope Pius XII, six months before the outbreak of war in Europe.

The Jewish "extermination" claims started in a subdued form in mid-1942. In his Christmas message for 1942, Pius XII made a passing remark, without specific reference to the Jews, to "the hundreds of thousands who, through no fault of their own, and solely because of their nation or race, have been condemned to death or progressive extinction." This is usually interpreted as a reference to genocidal persecutions of Jews, and that interpretation is arguable, but the context in which the statement was made is very revealing.

As is clear from the Vatican's published documents, the overriding objective of Vatican diplomacy at the time was the securing of an Allied pledge to not bomb Rome. On December 14, 1942, the Vatican Secretary of State, Cardinal Maglione, met with the British Minister to the Vatican, F. D'Arcy Osborne, to this end. Maglione's notes on the meeting present Osborne as suddenly changing the subject from the possible bombing of Rome to demanding that the Vatican "intervene to stop the massacres of the Jews."[1]

In reading Maglione's notes it is evident that the Pope's remark in his Christmas message was made under duress; Osborne made it seem to Maglione that the alternative was bombs. It is probably not the case that the Allied governments instructed Osborne to propose such a deal; perhaps the matter was on Osborne's mind only because an Allied declaration on the Jews was soon to come (on December 17). However, it is the case that Maglione's notes indicate that he thought such a deal was being proposed. This is the context of the remarks in the Christmas 1942 message of Pius XII. The Allies wanted something stronger, and later urged Pius XII to endorse their declaration of December 17, but he refused because "he felt that there had been some exaggeration for the purposes of propaganda."[2]

Pius XII made a remark, similar to that in his Christmas message, in a long address on June 2, 1943. Rome was first bombed on July 19, 1943, and I am not aware of any repetition of the Christmas remark, or of any like it, by Pius XII after Rome was bombed. He even said nothing about exterminations of Jews after the Germans had been driven out of Rome, and there could have been no danger in making such a declaration.

After the Nazis were defeated, Pius XII made an address to the College of Cardinals (June 2, 1945) in which he condemned "applications of National Socialist [that is, Nazi] teachings, which even went so far as to use the most exquisite scientific methods to torture or eliminate people who were often innocent." However reading further into the speech it becomes clear that the Pope, like so many other people at the time, was thinking of the catastrophic scenes found in the German camps at the end of the war. The only specific victims mentioned were the Catholic priests who died at Dachau. There is nothing in the address about extermination of any

racial, religious or national group.[3]

None of this is to imply that the Vatican under Pope Pius XII ignored the plight of the Jews. Its help to Italian Jews during the German occupation is well known. For example, several thousand Jews were given refuge in the Vatican after the Germans occupied Rome in 1943, and there were many other ways the Vatican helped Jews.[4]

In spring 1944, after the Germans had been driven out of Rome, Jews were able to come out of hiding. The joyous American Jewish Committee arranged a special broadcast, over a New York radio station, of a thanksgiving service by the Chief Rabbi of Rome, Israele Anton Zolli.[5] I have no record of the broadcast or service, but I assume that on this occasion Zolli expressed the same sort of gratitude to Pius XII, for helping Jews, that he was loudly expressing at the time in other contexts.[6]

Zolli was to go further. Partly out of "his gratitude [to Pius XII] on behalf of the Jewish community for aid offered during the German occupation," Zolli, "the spiritual head of the oldest Jewish community of Europe," converted to Roman Catholicism in February 1945, taking the baptismal name Eugenio, to honor the Pope.[7]

Zolli was not isolated in his gratitude. In November 1945 Jewish survivors of Nazi concentration camps, received by Pius XII, "thanked the pontiff for the generosity he had manifested during the terrible period of Nazi fascism." In March 1946 the Italian Jewish communities, meeting in Rome, "paid homage to the pope and expressed their deepest gratitude" to the Catholic Church for its help.[8]

These are some of the facts that I believe are either absent from, or whose implications are not grasped in, the debates on the behavior of Pius XII. An eloquent defense of Pius XII is to be found at the Web site of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights (www.catholicleague.org). This defense even mentions the Zolli conversion, an episode sometimes considered too "sensitive" to be mentioned. However such defenses do not satisfactorily confront the heart of the accusation: Pius XII did not speak up forthrightly against "extermination." The only exception that can be cited is an ambiguous declaration which, my analysis shows, was made under the threat of Allied bombs.

Nevertheless Pius XII won the loudly expressed gratitude of contemporaneous Jewish communities for what he did do for the Jews, but the implications of that fact are not grasped. For me, there are two principal implications. First, under the circumstances that Pius XII was in, there is no reason why he would not have condemned exterminations of Jews forthrightly and unambiguously, if he had known of them. And if they had happened, he would have known of them.

Pope Pius XII

Second, it is suggested that for those Jews the "extermination" was understood to be hyperbole, of a rhetorical substance not to be taken literally.

The defenders of Pius XII will have a difficult time if they do not understand these implications of the facts easily available in the historical record, and if they continue to sidestep the heart of the accusation.

Related matters are taken up in my obituary of Robert A. Graham (published in the March-April 1998 *Journal*, pp. 24-25).

— June 16, 1998

Notes

1. *Actes et documents du Saint Siège relatifs à la seconde guerre mondiale*, vol. 7, pp. 136ff.
2. Martin Gilbert, *Auschwitz and the Allies* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981), pp. 104-105.
3. *The New York Times*, June 3, 1945, p. 22.
4. Mark Aarons and John Loftus, *Unholy Trinity: How the Vatican's Nazi Networks Betrayed Western Intelligence to the Soviets* (New York: St. Martin's, 1991), Ch. 1.
5. *The New York Times*, July 22, 1944, p. 11, and July 24, 1944, p. 15. The second story transmits exultant remarks of American Lt. Gen. Mark Clark, who does not suggest that physical extermination of the Jews was ever a factor.
6. *The New York Times*, June 17, 1944, p. 5; July 9, 1944, p. 18; July 27, 1944, p. 3.
7. *The New York Times*, Feb. 15, 1945, p. 4; March 5, 1945, p. 17; Robert G. Weisbord and Wallace P. Sillanpoa, *The Chief Rabbi, the Pope, and the Holocaust* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1992), pp. 1f.
8. R. G. Weisbord and W.P. Sillanpoa, cited above, pp. 5f.

Jewish Group Demands More Anti-Revisionist Laws

An important association of Jewish legal experts is demanding new and more severe laws against Holocaust revisionism, reports a front-page article in the *Athens News*, June 28, 1998. A conference of International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists (IAJLJ), meeting in June in the northern Greek city of Thessaloniki, warned that "the international revisionist movement, using the Internet and an orchestrated propaganda campaign, could warp the historical memory of younger generations."

"The denial movement has a historical institute which is reviewing history and whose real aim is to deny the Holocaust," charged Itzhak Nener, an Israeli who is deputy president of the IAJLJ. "They have tremendous sums of money," he added.

"One aim of the conference," the *Athens News* reported, "is to convince more countries to pass legislation outlawing Holocaust denial." As it is, several European countries, including France, Germany, Austria and Switzerland, already enforce censorship laws making it a crime to dispute the orthodox Holocaust extermination story of six million Jewish wartime dead. "Nener and his colleagues said the relevant punishment was too lenient, and more countries should crack down on people claiming the Nazi slaughter of Jews never took place," the Athens paper went on.

Another conference participant, Isidor Wolfe, a lawyer from Vancouver, Canada, said: "This growing [revisionist] group is using web sites to make amazingly ridiculous claims, like that they measured the gas chambers and found they were not big enough for people."

The IAJLJ plans to hold conferences in more than 20 other European countries to lobby for more anti-revisionism laws.

The statements by Nener and Wolfe are typical, in that they exaggerate the financial resources of the international revisionist movement and grotesquely misrepresent revisionist arguments and findings. If revisionist arguments were really as absurd as these Jewish legal experts contend, there would hardly be a need for laws to punish anyone espousing them.

Actually, the anti-revisionist laws that are already in place, and the IAJLJ conference's call for more such legal measures, confirm the tremendous importance of the Holocaust story for Jewish-Zionist interests, and underscore the inability of defenders of the orthodox Holocaust story to respond to revisionist evidence and arguments with compelling evidence of their own.

Given the record, the IAJLJ call for harsher anti-revisionist laws is likely to be successful. In recent years European governments have generally been unwilling to resist Jewish demands for money or legal measures directed against real or perceived enemies.

— M.W.

Revisionist Activism in Sweden

Support for historical revisionism has traditionally been strong in northern Europe. Orders for books and tapes arrive regularly at the IHR from Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Finland — countries where most educated people understand English.

And unlike citizens of France, Germany and a few other countries, Scandinavians still enjoy the freedom to express skeptical views on controversial issues of 20th-century history. According to a survey conducted by Stockholm University and the Crime Prevention Council, and made public last year, nearly a third of Swedish secondary school students have doubts about the official Holocaust extermination story.

Certainly some of the credit for this is due to the work of Ahmed Rami, a Moroccan-born political exile who lives and works in Stockholm. For more than ten years now, he has been upsetting the complacent with his pro-revisionist and Islamist "Radio Islam" broadcasts, his Internet web site (www.abbc.com/islam), in leaflets, and in several books. In addition, Rami makes frequent visits to Arab and Muslim countries, where he and his views are widely respected. Much to the distress of Jewish-Zionist forces, Sweden's highest-level public prosecutor decided last September to drop all charges of inciting hatred against Rami's "Radio Islam" Internet Web site.

Rami, who addressed the 1992 IHR Conference, can be reached at Box 316, 10126 Stockholm, Sweden, or by e-mail at rami@abbc.com.

Also based in Sweden is the "Mimer" association, which has emerged in recent years as an important northern European revisionist center. It defends Swedish and European culture against "one worldism," dissects historical distortion, and counters Zionist propaganda. (In Nordic mythology, Mimer is the giant who guards the spring of wisdom at the root of the great ash tree, Ygdrasil, whose roots and branches bind together heaven, earth and hell.)

From time to time Mimer puts out an attractive

newsletter-magazine, now in its eighth year of publication. A typical issue of *Mimer* is 20-24 pages in length, often with one or two articles in English.

An article on the Jewish role in the black slave trade, along with an essay (in English) on Savitri Devi, the "Priestess of Hitlerism," appear in issue No. 24 (Nov. 1997).

An essay on the 1938 "Crystal Night" anti-Jewish outburst of violence in Germany appears in *Mimer* issue No. 25 (Dec. 1997). This piece is based on the book *Flashpoint* by German author Ingrid Weckert (published by the IHR). In this same issue is a good summary article, in question and answer format, on the origins of the Second World War, as well as a close look at the pivotal role of Danzig in the outbreak of war in 1939, and several articles on Nordic heritage and culture.

Mimer also gets out the word through its own Internet web site (www.mimer.org), and a book distribution service. Its catalog lists more than a hundred books and booklets dealing with history, current affairs and political philosophy, including several titles published by the IHR and Noontide Press.

Mimer can be reached at Box 15024, 20031 Malmö, Sweden, or by e-mail at webmaster@mimer.org

Georgi K. Zhukov

From Moscow to Berlin

Marshal Zhukov's Greatest Battles

The greatest Soviet commander talls how he directed the Red Army's bitter last-ditch defense of Moscow, master-minded the encirclement and defeat of the German Sixth Army at Stalingrad, smashed the last great German counteroffensive of Kursk-Orel, and led the climactic assault on Hitler's Berlin. Must reading for every student of military history. Hardcover, 304 pp., photos, maps, $12.95, plus $2.50 for shipping.

Available from

IHR • POB 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

Ahmed Rami, left, with French scholar Roger Garaudy.

Widespread Holocaust Doubts in Sweden

Nearly 30 percent of Sweden's elementary and secondary school pupils "have doubts" about the orthodox Holocaust extermination story, a recent survey shows. Calling this "an appalling warning sign," Prime Minister Goeran Persson responded by promising that his government will increase its emphasis on "Holocaust education." Beginning this fall, he said, the government will offer "Holocaust education materials" to all households with school-age children. (Source: *Boston Globe*, AP report, June 14, 1997).

Correction

There is an error in the article "French Courts Punish Holocaust Apostasy," in the March-April 1998 issue, page 14. The sentence after the subhead "Jean-Marie Le Pen" that begins the fifth paragraph (first column) should read as follows: "In 1987 Jean-Marie Le Pen, the leader of France's National Front political party, was found guilty of violating French law by referring to German execution gas chambers as a 'detail' or a 'minor point' in Second World War history." Contrary to the impression given by the original wording, in 1987 Le Pen did not transgress against the Fabius-Gayssot law, which was not promulgated until July 1990.

An Orthodox Historian Finally Acknowledges: There is No Evidence for Nazi Gas Chambers

Robert Faurisson

Born in 1939, Jacques Baynac is a French historian who is the author of several books.[1] A scholar whose sympathies lean to the left, he harbors a definite hostility toward revisionists (whom he calls "deniers"), and particularly toward revisionist writer and publisher Pierre Guillaume and myself. For years he affirmed the existence of Nazi homicidal gas chambers.

In 1996, though, Baynac acknowledged in two lengthy articles published in a Swiss daily newspaper that, taking everything into account, one is forced to admit — even if it is "as painful to say as it is to hear" — that the well-known "testimonies" are not sufficient proof of wartime homicidal gas chambers, and that it is simply not possible to prove, scientifically, that the homicidal gas chambers actually existed.

Given this lack of any direct proof, he continued, it will now be necessary to seek an indirect proof. Because one cannot prove that Nazi gas chambers existed, he goes on to write, it will instead be necessary to prove that it is impossible that they did not exist! Specifically, he writes: "If scholarly history cannot, because of the lack of documentation, establish the reality of a fact, it can, by means of documentation, establish that the unreality of this fact is itself unreal." [2]

Baynac made these remarkable statements in two lengthy articles published in the Swiss newspaper *Le Nouveau Quotidien de Lausanne*, September 2, 1996 (p. 16), and September 3, 1996 (p. 14).

The Evasion of Historians

In the first of these two articles, Baynac begins by deploring France's anti-revisionist "Fabius-Gayssot" law of July 13, 1990, which he says allows "the deniers' sect" to use the courts as podiums for their views. He notes that this law has been criticized by Claude Imbert of *Le Point* magazine, historian Pierre Vidal-Naquet (who has said: "I am ready to kill Faurisson, but not to pursue him in a court of law!"), Madeleine Rebérioux (former president of the "Human Rights League"), anti-revisionist attorney Charles Korman, and several parliamentary deputies of the Gaullist RPR party.

Baynac affirms that the revisionists/deniers have plenty of reason for rejoicing, especially since the Abbé Pierre affair "changed the atmosphere" in their favor. Baynac also notes that among the anti-revisionists, "disarray has given way to consternation," that historian Pierre Vidal-Naquet "is grieved," that the prominent French-Jewish intellectual Bernard-Henri Lévy "is beside himself," that Pierre-André Taguieff "is frightened," and that the front cover of an issue of the French magazine *L'Événement du jeudi* ("The Thursday Event") proclaimed "The Victory of the Revisionists."

Baynac denounces Jorge Semprun, an intellectual and former deportee, for having irresponsibly "murdered" a book by Florent Brayard that attacks French revisionist writer Paul Rassinier. Baynac believes that among Leftists there has come into being a "paranoia," a "witch-hunt" (in the words of Jean-François Kahn), and a "disastrous chaos." He notes that Simone Veil and Dominique Jamet share his dislike of the Fabius-Gayssot law, and that "one refuses to debate" the revisionists.

Baynac recalls the declaration by "34 reputable historians" published in the prominent French daily *Le Monde* on February 21, 1979 — a stupefying declaration that responded to but did not answer my challenge, which had appeared earlier in the paper, calling for an explanation of how, technically, the magical Nazi gas chambers were supposed to have operated. In this regard, Baynac writes of the "evasion" of historians in general, and goes on to declare that "the historians have retreated."

Neither Documents, Traces, Nor Proofs

In the second of his two articles, Baynac deplores the fact that anti-revisionist historians have trusted

---

Robert Faurisson was educated at the Paris Sorbonne, and served as a professor at the University of Lyon in France from 1974 until 1990. He was a specialist of text and document analysis. His writings on the Holocaust issue have appeared in four books and numerous scholarly articles, many of which have been published in this *Journal*.

This essay is a translation and adaptation of a text written in September 1996. We regret the delay in publishing it.



REVISIONISM: "The tomb is cracking!" In this cartoon, from the French weekly *National Hebdo* (May 9-16, 1996), "Konk" notes the enduring vitality of Holocaust revisionism, in spite of repeatedly being pronounced dead.

Jean-Claude Pressac, a pharmacist and "amateur historian," who now concludes that the number of Jewish and non-Jewish dead at Auschwitz amounts "to a total of 600,000 victims."[3] Baynac derides historian François Bayrou, France's Minister of National Education, who, conscious of the difficulties in trying to prove the "Holocaust" genocide and wartime homicidal gas chambers, advocates recourse to a "less burdened" historical method. Baynac sees in this a "light historical concept."

Baynac believes that Nazi gas chambers existed, but thinks that those who have tried to prove their existence have overly employed an "ascientific" methodology, rather than a "scientific" one. In this "ascientific" method, he goes on, "testimony prevails," while in the "scientific" method documents prevail. However, he adds with regret, one is able only to ascertain "the absence of documents, traces, or other material proofs."[4]

Baynac recalls the admission made in 1988 by Jewish-American historian Arno Mayer, who teaches at Princeton University: "Sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable."[5] Baynac goes on to say that "we do not have available indispensable elements for a normal undertaking of the historical method," and that "one must remain silent for lack of documents." He concludes with a remarkable concession: "it is necessary to recognize that the lack of traces involves the inability to directly establish the reality of the existence of homicidal gas chambers."[6] When he writes "the lack of traces," he means, as already mentioned, "the absence of documents, traces, or other material proofs."

Proofs for Tomorrow?

Baynac's study concludes with the suggestion, already mentioned: because it is decidedly impossible to prove that the gas chambers existed, let us try in the future to prove that these gas chambers were not able not to have existed!

This is an example of admitting a present-day inadequacy while postulating an act of faith for the future. Baynac is naive. He believes that because so many historians have emphatically affirmed the reality of the "Holocaust" horrors and the homicidal gas chambers, and so many survivors have claimed to have seen them, therefore they undoubtedly existed. He does not realize that, with time, one discovers that the writing of *history* is full of *histories* that are more or less imaginary.

He continues to believe in the gas chambers, just as he seems to persist in believing in Communism. Tomorrow, one will find proof for these gas chambers. Tomorrow, Communism will be true. Tomorrow, one will get a free lunch. Tomorrow, one will finally have the proof that National Socialism is the incarnation of evil and that Communism is the

—Le guide des festivals de l'été
L'EVENEMENT
DU JEUDI
L'abbé Pierre persiste. Gilles Perrault s'explique. Simone Veil accuse.
HOLOCAUSTE
La victoire des révisionnistes
PRIX 18F N° 608 DU 27 JUIN AU 3 JUILLET 1996

"Holocaust: The Revisionists' Victory" proclaims the French establishment weekly magazine *L'Événement du jeudi* ("The Thursday Event") on the front cover of its issue of June 27-July 3, 1996. This issue appeared during the national furor over a scholarly revisionist study by Roger Garaudy, *Les mythes fondateurs de la politique israélienne* ("The Founding Myths of Israeli Politics"), and the support he received from a widely respected priest, Abbé Pierre (also shown on the magazine's front cover).

incarnation of good. Let's hear it for the eternal credulity of the French intelligentsia!

Baynac joins, as it were, the "34 reputable historians" who, as already mentioned, in 1979 published one of the most monumental pieces of nonsense of French academic life: "It is not necessary to ask oneself how, technically, such a mass murder was possible. It was technically possible because it happened." Baynac thus adds his name to those of the 34 orthodox scholars who, without intending it, were obliged to agree with the revisionist historians on several important issues. This inevitably raises a question: how can judges continue to condemn revisionists for contesting a crime that, as Baynac now acknowledges, has not been proven?

Embarrassing Gas Chambers

It is quite clear that the "Nazi gas chambers" are ever more embarrassing for those who uphold the "Holocaust" thesis of Jewish extermination. As early as 1984, Pierre Vidal-Naquet warned friends who were already attempting to abandon the "gas chambers" that to do so would be "to capitulate in open country"[7] And in 1987 a periodical hostile to revisionism published a letter by two French-Jewish teachers, Ida Zajdel and Marc Ascione, suggesting that the Nazis had faked their confessions, and only mentioned gas chambers in order to plant "a delayed action 'bomb' against the Jews, an instrument of diversion and, why not, of blackmail."[8]

There are many other examples worth citing, but I will content myself here with citing just three recent ones: that of Elie Wiesel (in 1994), that of a Dutch professor of Jewish-Polish origin, Michel Korzec (in 1995), and finally, that of the Jewish-American historian Daniel Jonah Goldhagen (in 1996):

• In 1994, Wiesel wrote in his memoir, *All Rivers Run to the Sea*: "Let the gas chambers remain closed to prying eyes, and to imagination."[9] In plain English this means: "Let's not try to see, or even imagine, a Nazi gas chamber." What follows inevitably from this is that Wiesel is quite skeptical of the alleged witnesses who, supposedly, have described what happened in the gas chambers.

• In 1995 Michel Korzec declared that too much emphasis has been put on the gas chambers and the number of gassing victims. With dialectic contortions worthy of a cabalist, he went on to argue that it was the Germans, and not the Jews, who are responsible for this error. In Korzec's view, many more Germans participated in the "mass murder" of Jews than has been assumed, and in many more places across Europe — many more than the small number of Germans supposedly involved in gas chamber killings of Jews.[10]

• In his 1996 study, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, an exceedingly anti-German work, Daniel J. Goldhagen wrote: "Gassing was really epiphenomenal to the Germans' slaughter of Jews."[11] And in a 1996 interview with a major Austrian weekly news magazine he stated: "For me the industrialized annihilation of the Jews is not the central question in explaining the Holocaust ... The gas chambers are a symbol. But it is absurd to believe that the Holocaust would not have taken place without the gas chambers."[12]

So, by 1996 the gas chambers had become a *symbol*!

A Swiss Newspaper Sets An Example

In recent years I have described at various times, in *samizdat* essays and in interviews

recorded by Ernst Zündel in Canada, this evolution by the "exterminationists" regarding the "Nazi gas chambers." In a text I wrote on September 22, 1993 (and which I intend to publish in my forthcoming book), I predicted that one day organized Jewry eventually would be obliged to give up the lie about Nazi gas chambers, while at the same time still insisting that "the Holocaust" is an irrefutable truth. Consistent with this, the US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, has decided not to provide any physical representation of a German homicidal gas chamber (except for a door of a *delousing* gas chamber and an absurd and "artistic" model).[13]

The two 1996 articles by Jacques Baynac in the Swiss daily paper are only a stage in this metamorphosis of official historiography. Baynac's articles confirm that, for quite some time now, historians have broken with the facade of unanimity. Step by step, historians are rejecting the simplistic conclusions of the Nuremberg Tribunal regarding gas chambers and genocide.

When French judges declare that challenging the existence of Nazi gas chambers is to challenge "crimes against humanity" (which the genocide of the Jews would have been), they are correct. However, if there is no longer any proof of a specific murder weapon, logically there is no longer any proof of a specific crime. This conclusion, rather embarrassing for the judges who dare to condemn revisionism, follows inevitably from the position taken by Baynac, a position that, once again, is not in any way peculiar to him but represents a general trend in orthodox historiography. Baynac is simply saying out loud what his colleagues have been thinking in silence.

In publishing these two articles by Baynac, *Le Nouveau Quotidien* of Lausanne, normally so hostile toward revisionism, has shown both discernment and respect for its readers.[14]

Jacques Baynac: "There are no proofs, yet I believe."

Robert Faurisson: "There are no proofs, therefore I refuse to believe."

For the first: freedom of expression.

For the second: a sentence of one month to one year of prison, a fine of 2,000 to 300,000 francs, and additional penalties.

Robert Faurisson

Notes

1. Among the most noteworthy of Baynac's books have been *La Terreur sous Lénine* ("The Terror Under Lenin," 1975), *Ravachol et ses compagnons* ("Ravachol and His Companions," 1976), *Mai retrouvé* ("May [1968] Revisited," 1978), *Les Socialistes révolutionnaires russes, 1881-1917* ("The Russian Revolutionary Socialists, 1881-1917," 1979), and *La Révolution gorbatchévienne* ("The Gorbachev Revolution," 1988). In 1987, he published, along with historian Nadine Fresco, an anti-revisionist article in the Paris daily *Le Monde* entitled "Comment s'en débarrasser?" ("How Can We Get Rid of Them?" [that is, the revisionists]), June 18, 1987, p. 2.
2. "... si l'histoire scientifique ne peut, faute de documents, établir la réalité d'un fait, elle peut, avec des documents, établir que l'irréalité de ce fait est elle-même irréelle. En établissant que l'inexistence des chambres à gaz est impossible, on liquidera définitivement la prétention du négationnisme à se poser comme une école historique ..." *Le Nouveau Quotidien* (Lausanne), Sept. 3, 1996, p. 14.
3. *La Déportation: Le Système concentrationnaire nazi* ("The Deportation: The Nazi Concentration Camp System"), a work published under the direction of François Bédarida and Laurent Gervereau (BDIC, 1995), p. 196. Here Pressac estimates from 600,000 to 800,000 Auschwitz deaths,

   This is quite a drop from the figure of 9,000,000 given in the widely-viewed film "Night and Fog," or 4,000,000 as established by the Nuremberg Tribunal and as inscribed until 1990 on plaques at the monument at the Auschwitz camp site (where since 1995 the new figure is 1,500,000).

   On Pressac, see also: R. Faurisson, "Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers," Spring 1991 *Journal*, pp. 25-66 (Part I), and Summer 1991 *Journal*, pp. 133-175 (Part II); Arthur R. Butz,

"Some Thoughts on Pressac's Opus," May-June 1993 *Journal*, pp. 23-37; Serge Thion, "A French Scholar Responds to a Widely-Acclaimed Anti-Revisionist Work," July-August 1994 *Journal*, pp. 28 ff.; "'The Jewish World' Against Pressac," Jan.-Feb. 1996 *Journal*, p. 41.

4. "... l'absence de documents, de traces ou d'autres preuves matérielles ..." *Le Nouveau Quotidien*, Sept. 3, 1996, p. 14.
5. A. Mayer, *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?: The "Final Solution" in History* (New York: Pantheon, 1989), p. 362.
6. "... il faut reconnaître que la manque de traces entraîne l'incapacité d'établir directement la réalité de l'existence des chambres à gaz homicides." *Le Nouveau Quotidien* (Lausanne), Sept. 3, 1996, p. 14.
7. "Le Secret partagé" ("The Shared Secret"), *Le Nouvel Observateur*, Sept. 21, 1984, p. 80.
8. *Article 31*, Jan.-Feb. 1987, p. 22.
9. E. Wiesel, *All Rivers Run to the Sea*, Memoirs (New York: Random House/ Knopf, 1995), p. 74.
10. M. Korzec, "De mythe van de efficiënte massamoord" ("The Myth of Efficient Mass Murder"), *Intermediair*, December 15, 1995. See also: R. Faurisson, "A New Version of the Holocaust Story," March-April 1996 *Journal*, pp. 22-23.
11. D. J. Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Knopf, 1996), p. 521, n. 81. In this same book (p. 523, n. 4) Goldhagen also writes, "The imbalance of attention devoted to the gas chambers needs to be corrected."
12. *Profil* (Vienna), September 9, 1996, p. 75: "Die industrielle Vernichtung der Juden ist für mich nicht die Kernfrage zur Erklärung des Holocaust ... Die Gaskammern sind ein Symbol. Es ist aber ein Unsinn zu glauben, daß der Holocaust ohne Gaskammern nicht stattgefunden hätte."
13. During a visit to the US Holocaust Memorial Museum on August 30, 1994, I met with the Museum's Research Director, Michael Berenbaum. He told me, in the presence of witnesses, that "the decision had been made not to present any physical representation of a Nazi gas chamber." See also: R. Faurisson, "The US Holocaust Memorial Museum: A Challenge," July-August 1993 *Journal*, pp. 14-17; "Gas Chamber Door Fraudulently Portrayed at US Holocaust Museum," September-October 1993 *Journal*, p. 39; and, R. Faurisson, "Auschwitz: Facts and Legend," July-August 1997 *Journal*, pp. 16-17.
14. In the Baynac article in the September 2 issue of *Le Nouveau Quotidien*, p. 16, there are three minor errors: in the second column, one should read "Florent Brayard" (instead of "Florent Rassinier"); in the third column, "Jean-François Kahn" (in place of "Khan"); and, in the forth column, "Il ne faut pas se demander comment techniquement ...," instead of "Il ne faut pas se demander si techniquement ...," or, "It is not necessary to ask oneself how" (instead of "ask oneself if").

Promoting Holocaust Hatred of Germans

So much opprobrium has come to be attached to almost every aspect of the German past that it is impossible to say anything good about it without being condemned as a Nazi sympathizer. Nonetheless, it is hard not to conclude that the Germany of the past was vastly superior to the one about to dominate Europe for the next millennium. Germans today are whiny, parochial and unenterprising. They have 12 percent unemployment and the lowest birth rate in Europe. Their army is a joke. German ideas are copied from American liberals. Their courts have ruled it unconstitutional to display crosses in school. It is enough to make a Ludendorff, a Moltke, and a Bismarck cry.

Nazism, as far as I'm concerned, was in large part a response to Communism. That and the dishonorable treaty of Versailles, not to mention the disgrace of the German army ordered to lay down its arms on French soil. A decade ago, the learned Professor Ernst Nolte became the target of a campaign of defamation because he asked, "Didn't the Gulag Archipelago come before Auschwitz?" He also asked, "Wasn't the class-murder of the Bolsheviks the logical and factual presupposition of the race-murder of the Nazis?"

I say these are still rather good questions. Which brings me to the Jewish problem. It has been bothering me a lot lately. It has to do with people trafficking in the Holocaust — as vile an act as I can think and one that trivializes the suffering of millions. People like Alfonse D'Amato, Senator for New York, Abe Rosenthal of the New York Times, and the "leader of the Jewish community," Edgar Bronfman. Then there is the historian Daniel Goldhagen, author of Hitler's Willing Executioners.

The latter's central argument is that ordinary Germans were not forced to commit crimes against the Jews, but relished doing so. His achievement in writing his best-seller was not to add anything to our knowledge of the Holocaust but to stir up hatred of the Germans. In this he has been amazingly successful. The likes of fat Frank Rich, Abe Rosenthal, Tina Rosenberg — all of the New York Times — have been exulting.

Given the fact that Lenin's and Stalin's murder squads were more efficient than the Nazis' — as were Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge — the constant harping on about the Germans seems to be motivated by profit.

— From an essay by "Taki" in *The Spectator* (London), March 8, 1997, p. 48.

At Last ...

A full-scale debate on the Holocaust!



A terrific introduction to the hottest, most emotion-laden controversy of our time!

The Holocaust Story in the Crossfire: The Weber-Shermer Holocaust Debate

You'll be amazed as Occidental College professor Michael Shermer squares off against *Journal* editor Mark Weber in this unforgettable clash of wits on the most politicized chapter of 20th century history.

Shermer, just back from an inspection of the sites of the wartime concentration camps of Auschwitz, Majdanek, Mauthausen and Dachau, cites a "convergence of evidence" in his defense of the Holocaust story.

Weber, Director of the Institute for Historical Review, delivers a powerful summary of the revisionist critique of the Holocaust story, and gives a devastating response to Shermer's arguments.

Shermer, editor-publisher of *Skeptic* magazine, makes one startling concession after another. He acknowledges that numerous Holocaust claims — once "proven" by eyewitnesses and courts — are obviously not true. Shermer concedes, for example, that an execution "gas chamber" at Majdanek — shown to thousands of trusting tourists yearly — is a fraud. (At Nuremberg the Allies "proved" that the Germans murdered *one and half million* people at this one camp.)

This two hour clash — at a special IHR meeting on July 22, 1995 — dramatically gives the lie to the often-repeated claim that the Holocaust story is "undebatable."

The Holocaust Story in the Crossfire:
The Weber-Shermer Holocaust Debate

Quality VHS color video • 2 hours

$19.95, plus $2.00 shipping

Institute for Historical Review

P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

Exposing Stalin's Plan to Conquer Europe

How the Soviet Union 'Lost' the Second World War

Poslednyaya Respublika ("The Last Republic"), by Viktor Suvorov (Vladimir Rezun). Moscow: TKO ACT, 1996. 470 pages. Hardcover. Photographs.

Reviewed by Daniel W. Michaels

For several years now, a former Soviet military intelligence officer named Vladimir Rezun has provoked heated discussion in Russia for his startling view that Hitler attacked Soviet Russia in June 1941 just as Stalin was preparing to overwhelm Germany and western Europe as part of a well-planned operation to "liberate" all of Europe by bringing it under Communist rule.

Writing under the pen name of Viktor Suvorov, Rezun has developed this thesis in three books. *Icebreaker* (which has been published in an English-language edition) and *Dni M* ("M Day") were reviewed in the Nov.-Dec. 1997 *Journal*. The third book, reviewed here, is a 470-page work, "The Last Republic: Why the Soviet Union Lost the Second World War," published in Russian in Moscow in 1996.

Suvorov presents a mass of evidence to show that when Hitler launched his "Operation Barbarossa" attack against Soviet Russia on June 22, 1941, German forces were able to inflict enormous losses against the Soviets precisely because the Red troops were much better prepared for war — but for an *aggressive* war that was scheduled for early July — not the defensive war forced on them by Hitler's preemptive strike.

In *Icebreaker*, Suvorov details the deployment of Soviet forces in June 1941, describing just how Stalin amassed vast numbers of troops and stores of weapons along the European frontier, not to defend the Soviet homeland but in preparation for a westward attack and decisive battles on enemy territory.

Thus, when German forces struck, the bulk of Red ground and air forces were concentrated along the Soviet western borders facing contiguous European countries, especially the German Reich and Romania, in final readiness for an assault on Europe.

Daniel W. Michaels is a Columbia University graduate (Phi Beta Kappa, 1954), a Fulbright exchange student to Germany (1957), and recently retired from the US Department of Defense after 40 years of service.

In his second book on the origins of the war, "M Day" (for "Mobilization Day"), Suvorov details how, between late 1939 and the summer of 1941, Stalin methodically and systematically built up the best armed, most powerful military force in the world — actually the world's first superpower — for his planned conquest of Europe. Suvorov explains how Stalin's drastic conversion of the country's economy for war actually made war inevitable.

A Global Soviet Union

In "The Last Republic," Suvorov adds to the evidence presented in his two earlier books to strengthen his argument that Stalin was preparing for an aggressive war, in particular emphasizing the ideological motivation for the Soviet leader's actions. The title refers to the unlucky country that would be incorporated as the "final republic" into the globe-encompassing "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," thereby completing the world proletarian revolution.

As Suvorov explains, this plan was entirely consistent with Marxist-Leninist doctrine, as well as with Lenin's policies in the earlier years of the Soviet regime. The Russian historian argues convincingly that it was not Leon Trotsky (Bronstein), but rather Stalin, his less flamboyant rival, who was really the faithful disciple of Lenin in promoting world Communist revolution. Trotsky insisted on his doctrine of "permanent revolution," whereby the young Soviet state would help foment homegrown workers' uprisings and revolution in the capitalist countries.

Stalin instead wanted the Soviet regime to take advantage of occasional "armistices" in the global struggle to consolidate Red military strength for the right moment when larger and better armed Soviet forces would strike into central and western Europe, adding new Soviet republics as this overwhelming force rolled across the continent. After the successful consolidation and Sovietization of all of Europe, the expanded USSR would be poised to impose Soviet power over the entire globe.

As Suvorov shows, Stalin realized quite well that, given a free choice, the people of the advanced Western countries would never voluntarily choose Communism. It would therefore have to be imposed

by force. His bold plan, Stalin further decided, could be realized only through a world war.

A critical piece of evidence in this regard is his speech of August 19, 1939, recently uncovered in Soviet archives (quoted in part in the Nov.-Dec. 1997 *Journal*, pp. 32-33). In it, Lenin's heir states:

> The experience of the last 20 years has shown that in peacetime the Communist movement is never strong enough to seize power. The dictatorship of such a party will only become possible as the result of a major war ...
>
> Later on, all the countries who had accepted protection from resurgent Germany would also become our allies. We shall have a wide field to develop the world revolution.

Furthermore, and as Soviet theoreticians had always insisted, Communism could never peacefully coexist over the long run with other socio-political systems. Accordingly, Communist rule inevitably would have to be imposed throughout the world. So integral was this goal of "world revolution" to the nature and development of the "first workers' state" that it was a cardinal feature of the Soviet agenda even before Hitler and his National Socialist movement came to power in Germany in 1933.

Stalin elected to strike at a time and place of *his* choosing. To this end, Soviet development of the most advanced *offensive* weapons systems, primarily tanks, aircraft, and airborne forces, had already begun in the early 1930s. To ensure the success of his bold undertaking, in late 1939 Stalin ordered the build up a powerful war machine that would be superior in quantity and quality to all possible opposing forces. His first secret order for the total military-industrial mobilization of the country was issued in August 1939. A second total mobilization order, this one for *military* mobilization, would be issued on the day the war was to begin.

Disappointment

The German "Barbarossa" attack shattered Stalin's well-laid plan to "liberate" all of Europe. In this sense, Suvorov contends, Stalin "lost" the Second World War. The Soviet premier could regard "merely" defeating Germany and conquering eastern and central Europe only as a disappointment.

According to Suvorov, Stalin revealed his disappointment over the war's outcome in several ways. First, he had Marshal Georgi Zhukov, not himself, the supreme commander, lead the victory parade in 1945. Second, no official May 9 victory parade was even authorized until after Stalin's death. Third, Stalin never wore any of the medals he was awarded after the end of the Second World War. Fourth, once, in a depressed mood, he expressed to members of his close circle his desire to retire now that the war was over. Fifth, and perhaps most telling, Stalin abandoned work on the long-planned Palace of Soviets.

In August 1939 Stalin ordered a massive two-year military-industrial mobilization in preparation for a powerful Soviet attack against Germany. However, his plan to overwhelm Europe in a decisive military assault was dashed by Hitler's preemptive "Barbarossa" strike.

An Unfinished Monument

The enormous Palace of Soviets, approved by the Soviet government in the early 1930s, was to be 1,250 feet tall, surmounted with a statue of Lenin 300 feet in height — taller than New York's Empire State Building. It was to be built on the site of the former Cathedral of Christ the Savior. On Stalin's order, this magnificent symbol of old Russia was blown up in 1931 — an act whereby the nation's Communist rulers symbolically erased the soul of old Russia to make room for the centerpiece of the world USSR.

All the world's "socialist republics," including the "last republic," would ultimately be represented in

Viktor Suvorov (Vladimir Rezun)

the Palace. The main hall of this secular shrine was to be inscribed with the oath that Stalin had delivered in quasi-religious cadences at Lenin's burial. It included the words: "When he left us, Comrade Lenin bequeathed to us the responsibility to strengthen and expand the Union of Socialist Republics. We vow to you, Comrade Lenin, that we shall honorably carry out this, your sacred commandment."

However, only the bowl-shaped foundation for this grandiose monument was ever completed, and during the 1990s, after the collapse the USSR, the Christ the Savior Cathedral was painstakingly rebuilt on the site.

The Official View

For decades the official version of the 1941-1945 German-Soviet conflict, supported by establishment historians in both Russia and the West, has been something like this:

> Hitler launched a surprise "Blitzkrieg" attack against the woefully unprepared Soviet Union, fooling its leader, the unsuspecting and trusting Stalin. The German *Führer* was driven by lust for "living space" and natural resources in the primitive East, and by his long-simmering determination to smash "Jewish Communism" once and for all. In this treacherous attack, which was an important part of Hitler's mad drive for "world conquest," the "Nazi" or "fascist" aggressors initially overwhelmed all resistance with their preponderance of modern tanks and aircraft.

This view, which was affirmed by the Allied judges at the postwar Nuremberg Tribunal, is still widely accepted in both Russia and the United States. In Russia today, most of the general public (and not merely those who are nostalgic for the old Soviet regime), accepts this "politically correct" line. For one thing, it "explains" the Soviet Union's enormous World War II losses in men and materiel.

Doomed from the Start

Contrary to the official view that the Soviet Union was not prepared for war in June 1941, in fact, Suvorov stresses, it was the Germans who were not really prepared. Germany's hastily drawn up "Operation Barbarossa" plan, which called for a "Blitzkrieg" victory in four or five months by numerically inferior forces advancing in three broad military thrusts, was doomed from the outset.

Moreover, Suvorov goes on to note, Germany lacked the raw materials (including petroleum) essential in sustaining a drawn out war of such dimensions.

Another reason for Germany's lack of preparedness, Suvorov contends, was that her military leaders seriously under-estimated the performance of Soviet forces in the Winter War against Finland, 1939-40. They fought, it must be stressed, under extremely severe winter conditions — temperatures of minus 40 degrees Celsius and snow depths of several feet — against the well-designed reinforced concrete fortifications and underground facilities of Finland's "Mannerheim Line." In spite of that, it is often forgotten, the Red Army did, after all, force the Finns into a humiliating armistice.

It is always a mistake, Suvorov emphasizes, to underestimate your enemy. But Hitler made this critical miscalculation. In 1943, after the tide of war had shifted against Germany, he admitted his mistaken evaluation of Soviet forces two years earlier.

Tank Disparity Compared

To prove that it was Stalin, and not Hitler, who was really prepared for war, Suvorov compares German and Soviet weaponry in mid-1941, especially with respect to the all-important offensive weapons systems — tanks and airborne forces. It is a generally accepted axiom in military science that attacking forces should have a numerical superiority of three to one over the defenders. Yet, as Suvorov explains, when the Germans struck on the morning of June 22, 1941, they attacked with a total of 3,350 tanks, while the Soviet defenders had a total of 24,000 tanks — that is, Stalin had *seven times more* tanks than Hitler, or *21 times* more tanks than would have been considered sufficient for an adequate defense. Moreover, Suvorov stresses, the Soviet tanks were superior in all technical respects, including firepower, range, and armor plating.

As it was, Soviet development of ***heavy*** tank production had already begun in the early 1930s. For example, as early as 1933 the Soviets were already turning out in series production, and distributing to their forces, the T-35 model, a 45-ton heavy tank with three cannons, six machine guns, and 30-mm armor plating. By contrast, the Germans began development and production of a comparable 45-ton

tank only after the war had begun in mid-1941.

By 1939 the Soviets had already added three heavy tank models to their inventory. Moreover, the Soviets designed their tanks with wider tracks, and to operate with diesel engines (which were less flammable than those using conventional carburetor mix fuels). Furthermore, Soviet tanks were built with both the engine and the drive in the rear, thereby improving general efficiency and operator viewing. German tanks had a less efficient arrangement, with the engine in the rear and the drive in the forward area.

When the conflict began in June 1941, Suvorov shows, Germany had no heavy tanks at all, only 309 medium tanks, and just 2,668 light, inferior tanks. For their part, the Soviets at the outbreak of the war had at their disposal tanks that were not only heavier but of higher quality.

In this regard, Suvorov cites the recollection of German tank general Heinz Guderian, who wrote in his memoir *Panzer Leader* (1952/1996, p. 143):

> In the spring of 1941, Hitler had specifically ordered that a Russian military commission be shown over our tank schools and factories; in this order he had insisted that nothing be concealed from them. The Russian officers in question firmly refused to believe that the Panzer IV was in fact our heaviest tank. They said repeatedly that we must be hiding our newest models from them, and complained that we were not carrying out Hitler's order to show them everything. The military commission was so insistent on this point that eventually our manufacturers and Ordnance Office officials concluded: "It seems that the Russians must already possess better and heavier tanks than we do." It was at the end of July 1941 that the T34 tank appeared on the front and the riddle of the new Russian model was solved.

Suvorov cites another revealing fact from Robert Goralski's *World War II Almanac* (1982, p. 164). On June 24, 1941 — just two days after the outbreak of the German-Soviet war:

> The Russians introduced their giant Klim Voroshilov tanks into action near Raseiniai [Lithuania]. Models weighing 43 and 52 tons surprised the Germans, who found the KVs nearly unstoppable. One of these Russian tanks took 70 direct hits, but none penetrated its armor.

In short, Germany took on the Soviet colossus with tanks that were too light, too few in number, and inferior in performance and fire power. And this disparity continued as the war progressed. In 1942 alone, Soviet factories produced 2,553 heavy tanks, while the Germans produced just 89. Even at the



By mid-June 1941, enormous Red Army forces were concentrated on the western Soviet border, poised for a devastating attack against Europe. This diagram appeared in the English-language edition of the German wartime illustrated magazine *Signal*.

On the morning of June 22, 1941, Hitler launched the "Barbarossa" strike against the USSR, the largest military attack in history, to forestall an imminent Soviet assault. As Russian historian Suvorov shows, the German leader fatally underestimated Soviet strength and endurance. By striking first, though, Hitler saved at least western Europe from Soviet subjugation.

end of the war, the best-quality tank in combat was the Soviet IS ("Iosef Stalin") model.

Suvorov sarcastically urges establishment military historians to study a book on Soviet tanks by Igor P. Shmelev, published in 1993 by, of all things, the Hobby Book Publishing Company in Moscow. The work of an honest amateur military analyst such as Shmelev, one who is sincerely interested in and loves his hobby and the truth, says Suvorov, is often superior to that of a paid government employee.

Airborne Forces Disparity

Even more lopsided was the Soviet superiority in airborne forces. Before the war, Soviet DB-3f and SB bombers as well as the TB-1 and TB-3 bombers (of which Stalin had about a thousand had been modified to carry airborne troops as well as bomb loads. By mid-1941 the Soviet military had trained hundreds of thousands of paratroopers (Suvorov says almost a million) for the planned attack against Germany and the West. These airborne troops were to be deployed and dropped behind enemy lines in several waves, each wave consisting of five airborne assault corps (VDKs), each corps consisting of 10,419 men, staff and service personnel, an artillery division, and a separate tank battalion (50 tanks). Suvorov lists the commanding officers and home bases of the first two waves or ten corps. The second and third wave corps included troops who spoke French and Spanish.

Because the German attack prevented these highly trained troops from being used as originally planned, Stalin converted them to "guards divisions," which he used as reserves and "fire brigades" in emergency situations, much as Hitler often deployed Waffen SS forces.

Maps and Phrase Books

In support of his main thesis, Suvorov cites additional data that were not mentioned in his two earlier works on this subject. First, on the eve of the outbreak of the 1941 war Soviet forces had been provided topographical maps only of frontier and European areas; they were not issued maps to defend Soviet territory or cities, because the war was not to be fought in the homeland. The head of the Military Topographic Service at the time, and therefore responsible for military map distribution, Major General M. K. Kudryavtsev, was not punished or even dismissed for failing to provide maps of the homeland, but went on to enjoy a lengthy and successful military career. Likewise, the chief of the General Staff, General Zhukov, was never held responsible for the debacle of the first months of the war. None of the top military commanders could be held accountable, Suvorov points out, because they had all followed Stalin's orders to the letter.

Second, in early June 1941 the Soviet armed forces began receiving thousands of copies of a Russian-German phrase book, with sections dedicated to such offensive military operations as seizing railroad stations, orienting parachutists, and so forth, and such useful expressions as "Stop transmitting or I'll shoot." This phrase book was produced in great numbers by the military printing houses in both Leningrad and Moscow. However, they never reached the troops on the front lines, and are said to have been destroyed in the opening phase of the war.

Aid from the 'Neutral' United States

As Suvorov notes, the United States had been supplying Soviet Russia with military hardware

Soviet premier Joseph Stalin, American President Franklin Roosevelt and British prime minister Winston Churchill at their 1943 conference in Tehran, Iran. At this meeting, the "Big Three" strengthened the anti-German alliance that won the Second World War. A joint statement issued by the three Allied leaders on November 28, 1943, concluded with the words: "We leave here, friends in fact, in spirit and in purpose."

since the late 1930s. He cites Antony C. Sutton's study, *National Suicide* (Arlington House, 1973), which reports that in 1938 President Roosevelt entered into a secret agreement with the USSR to exchange military information. For American public consumption, though, Roosevelt announced the imposition of a "moral embargo" on Soviet Russia.

In the months prior to America's formal entry into war (December 1941), Atlantic naval vessels of the ostensibly neutral United States were already at war against German naval forces. (See *Mr. Roosevelt's Navy: The Private War of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, 1939-1942* by Patrick Abbazia [Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1975]). And two days after the "Barbarossa" strike, Roosevelt announced US aid to Soviet Russia in its war for survival against the Axis. Thus, at the outbreak of the "Barbarossa" attack, Hitler wrote in a letter to Mussolini: "At this point it makes no difference whether America officially enters the war or not, it is already supporting our enemies in full measure with mass deliveries of war materials."

Similarly, Winston Churchill was doing everything in his power during the months prior to June 1941 — when British forces were suffering one military defeat after another — to bring both the United States and the Soviet Union into the war on Britain's side. In truth, the "Big Three" anti-Hitler coalition (Stalin, Roosevelt, Churchill) was effectively in place even before Germany attacked Russia, and was a major reason why Hitler felt compelled to strike against Soviet Russia, and to declare war on the United States five months later. (See Hitler's speech of December 11, 1941, published in the Winter 1988-89 *Journal*, pp. 394-396, 402-412.)

The reasons for Franklin Roosevelt's support for Stalin are difficult to pin down. President Roosevelt himself once explained to William Bullitt, his first ambassador to Soviet Russia: "I think that if I give him [Stalin] everything I possibly can, and ask nothing from him in return, *noblesse oblige*, he won't try to annex anything, and will work with me for a world of peace and democracy." (Cited in: Robert Nisbet, *Roosevelt and Stalin: The Failed Courtship* [1989], p. 6.) Perhaps the most accurate (and

Soviet troops hoist the red hammer and sickle flag over the Reichstag in Berlin, an act that symbolized the Soviet subjugation of eastern and central Europe. The Battle of Berlin climaxed the titanic struggle of German and Soviet forces that began on June 22, 1941. On the afternoon of April 30, 1945, as Soviet troops were storming the Reichstag building, Hitler committed suicide in his nearby bunker headquarters.

kindest) explanation for Roosevelt's attitude is a profound ignorance, self-deception or naiveté. In the considered view of George Kennan, historian and former high-ranking US diplomat, in foreign policy Roosevelt was "a very superficial man, ignorant, dilettantish, with a severely limited intellectual horizon."

A Desperate Gamble

Suvorov admits to being fascinated with Stalin, calling him "an animal, a wild, bloody monster, but a genius of all times and peoples." He commanded the greatest military power in the Second World War, the force that more than any other defeated Germany. Especially in the final years of the conflict, he dominated the Allied military alliance. He must have regarded Roosevelt and Churchill contemptuously as useful idiots.

In early 1941 everyone assumed that because Germany was still militarily engaged against Britain in north Africa, in the Mediterranean, and in the Atlantic, Hitler would never permit entanglement in a second front in the East. (Mindful of the disastrous experience of the First World War, he had warned in *Mein Kampf* of the mortal danger of a two front war.) It was precisely because he was confident that Stalin assumed Hitler would not open a second front, contends Suvorov, that the German leader felt free to launch "Barbarossa." This attack, insists Suvorov, was an enormous and desperate gamble. But threatened by superior Soviet forces poised to overwhelm Germany and Europe, Hitler had little choice but to launch this preventive strike.

But it was too little, too late. In spite of the advantage of striking first, it was the Soviets who finally prevailed. In the spring of 1945, Red army troops succeeded in raising the red banner over the Reichstag building in Berlin. It was due only to the immense sacrifices of German and other Axis forces that Soviet troops did not similarly succeed in raising the Red flag over Paris, Amsterdam, Copenhagen, Rome, Stockholm, and, perhaps, London.

The Debate Sharpens

In spite of resistance from "establishment" historians (who in Russia are often former Communists), support for Suvorov's "preventive strike" thesis has been growing both in Russia and in western Europe. Among those who sympathize with Suvorov's views are younger Russian historians such as Yuri L. Dyakov, Tatyana S. Bushuyeva, and I. V. Pavlova. (See the Nov.-Dec. 1997 *Journal*, pp. 32-34.)

With regard to 20th-century history, American historians are generally more close-minded than their counterparts in Europe or Russia. But even in the United States there have been a few voices of support for the "preventive war" thesis — which is all the more noteworthy considering that Suvorov's books on World War II, with the exception of *Icebreaker*, have not been available in English. (One such voice is that of historian Russell Stolfi, a professor of Modern European History at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California. See the review of his book *Hitler's Panzers East* in the Nov.-Dec. 1995 *Journal*.)

Not all the response to Suvorov's work has been positive, though. It has also prompted criticism and renewed affirmations of the decades-old orthodox view. Among the most prominent new defenders of the orthodox "line" are historians Gabriel Gorodetsky of Tel Aviv University, and John Ericson of

Edinburgh University.

Rejecting all arguments that might justify Germany's attack, Gorodetsky in particular castigates and ridicules Suvorov's works, most notably in a book titled, appropriately, "The Icebreaker Myth." In effect, Gorodetsky (and Ericson) attribute Soviet war losses to the supposed unpreparedness of the Red Army for war. "It is absurd," Gorodetsky writes, "to claim that Stalin would ever entertain any idea of attacking Germany, as some German historians now like to suggest, in order, by means of a surprise attack, to upset Germany's planned preventive strike."

Not surprisingly, Gorodetsky has been praised by Kremlin authorities and Russian military leaders. Germany's "establishment" similarly embraces the Israeli historian. At German taxpayers expense, he has worked and taught at Germany's semi-official Military History Research Office (MGFA), which in April 1991 published Gorodetsky's *Zwei Wege nach Moskau* ("Two Paths to Moscow")

In the "Last Republic," Suvorov responds to Gorodetsky and other critics of his first two books on Second World War history. He is particularly scathing in his criticisms of Gorodetsky's work, especially "The Icebreaker Myth."

Some Criticisms

Suvorov writes caustically, sarcastically, and with great bitterness. But if he is essentially correct, as this reviewer believes, he — and we — have a perfect right to be bitter for having been misled and misinformed for decades.

Although Suvorov deserves our gratitude for his important dissection of historical legend, his work is not without defects. For one thing, his praise of the achievements of the Soviet military industrial complex, and the quality of Soviet weaponry and military equipment, is exaggerated, perhaps even panegyric. He fails to acknowledge the Western origins of much of Soviet weaponry and hardware. Soviet engineers developed a knack for successfully modifying, simplifying and, often, improving, Western models and designs. For example, the rugged diesel engine used in Soviet tanks was based on a German BMW aircraft diesel.

One criticism that cannot in fairness be made of Suvorov is a lack of patriotism. Mindful that the first victims of Communism were the Russians, he rightly draws a sharp distinction between the Russian people and the Communist regime that ruled them. He writes not only with the skill of an able historian, but with reverence for the millions of Russians whose lives were wasted in the insane plans of Lenin and Stalin for "world revolution."

Could *You* Survive a Nuclear Attack?

Why I Survived The A-Bomb

By **Akira Kohchi** (Albert Kawachi)

Until now, the *real* story of the first nuclear holocaust had not been told. Previous books on the atomic bombings of Hiroshima approached it only obliquely: technical works hailed it as a marvel of nuclear science, and books written from the military perspective honored the men who gave and carried out a difficult order. Even the eyewitness accounts, numbering some two thousand—and almost all yet to be translated from the Japanese—are overwhelmingly stories of *personal* misery. The total picture—the background, scope, and consequences of the catastrophe—has, until now, never been presented.

Why I Survived the A-Bomb tells a unique and fascinating story as seen from inside Japan 48 years ago and today. The author is eminently qualified—he lived through the experience of a nuclear attack and walked through the flaming, radioactive city of Hiroshima!

Albert Kawachi, a longtime United Nations finance officer, explores the attempts at political and economic justifications for the atom-bombing as he describes the day-to-day living experiences of his family in its wake. His story is dramatic, informative, and historically revisionist.

Holocaust survivor and author Albert Kawachi

What was it really like to survive the massive devastation, then deal with the suffering and humiliation wrought by this American doomsday weapon? Who was behind the use of the bomb in the first place? And what did it really accomplish? We need real answers to these hard questions before we speak glibly of defense and disarmament, and before we argue over trade imbalances and deficits, for what happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki could be our tomorrow.

Chapters include: At the Beginning • The Pacific • The Home Battleground • Hiroshima on August 6, 1945 • The Days After • The Surrender of Japan and Her Recovery • My America and "Pearl Harbor" • Hiroshima and Me • At the End

Why I Survived the A-Bomb
Hardbound • 230 pages • Photos, Notes, Appendices
$13.95 + $2.50 postage
from Institute for Historical Review

Best-selling British historian David Irving takes aim at the Trial of Century — the Nuremberg Tribunal of 1945-46.

Nuremberg: The Last Battle

Here is David Irving's stunning new masterwork of startling facts and myth-busting perspective — packed with revelations from long-suppressed private diaries and letters of judges, prosecutors, defendants and witnesses.

This latest bombshell by the internationally famed dissident scholar of World War II and the Third Reich history has already enraged the "traditional enemy" of truth in history. Sumptuously illustrated with more than 70 photographs, many in full color and published here for the first time.

You'll be proud to own this handsome hardcover masterpiece!

- Establishes that the Allies who sat in judgment were themselves guilty of many of the crimes for which the German defendants were tried and hanged.
- Exposes the Tribunal's double standard, with the Allies acting as judge, prosecution, jury and executioner.
- Reveals how Auschwitz Commandant Höss and other Germans were tortured to produce phony "evidence" that is still widely accepted today.
- Shows the cruel postwar mistreatment by the Allies of millions of Germans.
- Records how Hermann Göring, the main Nuremberg defendant, outwitted US prosecutor Robert Jackson in an unforgettable courtroom exchange.
- Shows how the incessantly repeated "six million" figure of Jewish genocide victims was invented.

Nuremberg: The Last Battle

Hardcover. Dust jacket. 380 pp. Photos. Source notes. Index. (0808)
Price: $39.95, plus shipping ($4.00 domestic, $5.00 foreign)
California residents must add 7.75% ($3.10) sales tax.

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, USA

Letters

The Deir Yassin Massacre

In his letter in the Sept.-Oct. 1997 *Journal*, B.H. of Jerusalem, Israel, writes that "the Deir Yassin 'massacre' is a myth."

This is not true. Jewish-American scholar Alfred Lilienthal, the author of several important books on the Middle East, wrote in detail about this wanton and unprovoked massacre in his valuable study, *The Zionist Connection* (pages 153-158).

Jewish terrorists carried out the April 1948 massacre of 254 inhabitants of the Palestinian village of Deir Yassin, mostly old men, women and children, to strike fear in the hearts of the Arabs and panic them into fleeing the country. The plan worked.

As Menachem Begin later proudly admitted in his memoir, *The Revolt*, reports about Deir Yassin and similar incidents provoked a "maddened, uncontrollable stampede. Of the about 800,000 Arabs who lived on the present territory of the state of Israel, only 165,000 are still there ... The Arabs, who began fleeing in panic, shouting 'Deir Yassin!' ... The political and economic significance of this development can hardly be overestimated."

F.M.
Los Angeles

New CODOH Ad Campaign

Bradley Smith and his Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH) have been placing advertisements in newspapers offering a $250,000 reward to anyone who will sponsor a debate on the Holocaust issue, to be broadcast on prime time nationwide television, between Smith and a representative of the Zionist Anti-Defamation League.

I have paid for publication of this ad in our local daily paper. Smith deserves support for this bold initiative. He can be reached at CODOH, MCD P-111, P.O. Box 439016, San Diego, CA 92143, or on-line at www.codoh.com.

Harvey Taylor
Nicolaus, Calif.

Truth's Beacon

Congratulations on the remarkable May-June [1998] issue. The *Journal* seems to get better all the time!

We value the great work you're doing to uncover the facts. With all their power, the forces of darkness are often temporarily able to obstruct the radiance of truth. In spite of the barrage of monstrous lies, you are succeeding not only in upholding, but in increasing, the brightness of truth's beacon. I rejoice with you.

I.H.
East Bridgewater, Mass.

Authentic Nazi 'Secret Speech'?

Recently I came across the enclosed front-page article from the *Norfolk Virginian-Pilot* of December 6, 1940, which appears under the sensational headline: "Secret Speech Outlines Plans of Hitler for World Mastery; Defeat of America Included." It claims to be the text of an address delivered in May 1940 by Walther Darré, Germany's Agriculture Minister, "to a number of high German officials." *Life* magazine also published the text of this speech, the paper reports.

In this address, Darré boasts that Germany is "predestined to rule the whole world." He describes Africa (of all places!) as the "the natural and indisputable 'living space' of Germany." Ruling everywhere, he declares, will be a new German "aristocracy" that "will have slaves assigned to it, these slaves to be their property and to consist of landless, non-German nationals." Darré supposedly also boasts that "The United States will be forced by Germany to complete and final capitulation ... Mr. Roosevelt will then beg the Führer on his knees ..."

Can you tell me if this speech is authentic or propaganda?

J.S.
Hawley, Penn.

This "secret speech" is a fraud. From numerous German documents confiscated after the war, and from many other sources, we know that this "speech" is radically inconsistent with the thinking of the country's leaders, and with German policy. We know, for example, that Hitler strenuously sought to avoid conflict with the United States. And just about the last high-ranking German official who might conceivably have mouthed the arrogant nonsense in this "secret speech" would have been Darré, who had no responsibility for foreign policy. If this speech actually had any foundation in reality, some trace of it would have been discovered among the voluminous records confiscated at the end of the war, and it would have been cited endlessly as indisputable proof of Hitler's perfidy and aggressive intentions.

This "secret speech" is typical of the many anti-German propaganda lies aimed at the American public during this period to build support for President Franklin Roosevelt's secret campaign to bring the United States into war against Germany. In a radio address broadcast nationwide on October 27, 1941, Roosevelt himself solemnly announced that he had "in my possession a secret map, made in Germany by Hitler's government" that supposedly proved German plans to take over Latin America. "That map, my friends, makes clear the Nazi

design not only against South America but against the United States as well."

In this same speech, Roosevelt claimed to have "another document made in Germany by Hitler's government," this one a "detailed plan to abolish all existing religions." Like the purported speech by Darré, these "documents" are fabrications. (See "Roosevelt's 'Secret Map' Speech," Spring 1985 Journal, pp. 125-127.)

— The Editor

Doesn't Believe

I'm very angered by this 68 [*sic*] questions and answers on the holocaust. I do not think this paper should be given out. I can not believe that people believe in this. 6 million Jews were killed and they are my ancestors ...

I'm a Jewish teenage girl, 15 years old. My family lives in Israel and my grandparents lived through it, they were luck, but my parents' aunts and uncles and other family members were being killed not because there ugly, pretty but because they were Jewish.

[unsigned and sent anonymously]

Lambasting Indians

I am writing to express my displeasure at the inclusion of Mark Twain's polemic against the American Indian, "The Noble Red Man," in the May-June [1998] issue. To dump mercilessly on a people for being starving beggars, especially by a member of the group that is responsible the destruction of their natural support infrastructure, I find disgusting. The appearance of this mean-spirited, racist diatribe in an otherwise insightful and well-balanced periodical is most unfortunate.

A.S.
Ridgewood, New York

In publishing Mark Twain's essay in the May-June issue, you copy the same Jewish treatment of Gentiles that is deservedly criticized in the review of Kevin MacDonald's book that appears in the same issue. Such inconsistency does you no good. If we have the right to describe any other ethnic group spitefully, we should not be offended when others describe us in the same way.

[by Internet]

Your lambasting the poor Indians in the May-June issue was an unfortunate departure from your primary area of concern. I'm enclosing a money order for a donation [$25], and a book order.

K.C.
Ithaca, New York

More, Please

Congratulations on your article on Jewish terrorism in France in the March-April 1996 issue. It was mind boggling and deserves the widest possible circulation. Please continue to expand upon the "Six Million" issue while keeping in mind its critically important role in today's world.

Also very good was the lengthy essay in the Jan.-Feb. [1996] issue on the Inquisition and the "Jewish Question" in Spain. I very much hope you will continue to publish similarly detailed accounts on the Jewish impact in history. Such essays serve to bring this crucial issue into the open. More, more — please!

W.P.
Madison, Ind.

Christophersen's Grave Vandalized

From January to December 1944, Thies Christophersen was a German army officer stationed at the Auschwitz camp complex. In a widely-distributed memoir, first published in 1973, he wrote about the reality of the notorious internment center. His memoir was one of the first important works to forthrightly and skeptically confront Auschwitz extermination claims. "During the time I was in Auschwitz, he wrote in his report, "I did not notice the slightest evidence of mass gassings."

Driven from Germany, this pioneer revisionist writer and courageous fighter for truth in history was forced to live in exile in countries where his "thought crimes" are not illegal. Then, in declining health, he returned to northern Germany to spend his final days in his beloved homeland. (See "Thies Christophersen" in the May-June 1997 *Journal*, p. 32)

But even his death in February 1997 did not put a stop to the hounding by the "never forgive, never forget" crowd. Several months after his passing, unknown vandals dug up Thies Christophersen's grave stone and hauled it away.

L.B.
Menlo Park, Calif.

A Minor Error

My respect for Kevin MacDonald's insight and courage grew as I read your persuasive review of his recently-published study, *Separation and its Discontents*. It's a wonder that this work was published by a well-regarded, "establishment" publisher.

I am writing, though, to point out a minor error. MacDonald is quoted as writing: "Jewish religious consciousness centers to a remarkable extent around the memory of persecution. Persecution is the central theme of the holidays of Passover, Hanukkah, Purim, and Yom Kippur." While this is certainly true of the first of the three-named Jewish holidays, it is not accurate to say that persecution is a central theme of the "Day of Atonement."

According to the book of Leviticus (16:29-34), Yahweh told Moses that the Hebrews should forever observe this solemn day as "an everlasting statute unto you, that once a year atonement may be made for the people of Israel for all their sins."

E. Svedlund
Seattle

We welcome letters from readers. We reserve the right to edit for style and space. Write: Editor, P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, CA 92659, *USA, or e-mail us at* editor@ihr.org

The Heart-warming, Infuriating, Informative, and Revisionist memoir that Dares to Tell the Truth About the Postwar Trials of the Germans

INNOCENT AT DACHAU

AMERICAN TEENAGER JOE HALOW was still a boy when he sailed to war-ravaged Germany in late 1946. The year he spent there, taking part in some of the most sensational of the war-crimes trials of the defeated Nazis, turned him into a man.

Innocent at Dachau is Joe Halow's account of his year in postwar Germany, above all his work as a court reporter during the U.S. Army courts-martial at Dachau. There Halow witnessed, recorded and transcribed some of the most gripping testimony from some of the most sensational trials of the postwar years: of SS guards from Buchenwald, Mauthausen, and Dora/Nordhausen; of the inmates who carried out their orders as kapos (prisoner trusties); and of German villagers who attacked and murdered downed American fliers in the last phase of the Allies' terrifying air war.



Armed with an ironclad faith in American righteousness when he arrived, young Halow soon saw the flaws and abuses in the trials: reliance on *ex post facto* law and broad conspiracy theories; abuse of prisoners during interrogation; and the shocking tolerance, even encouragement, of perjured testimony by concentration camp survivors. The teenaged American court reporter came to sympathize with the plight of the accused, particularly those convicted, sentenced or executed unjustly.

Innocent at Dachau is Joe Halow's story of his coming of age, of his loss of innocence in the Dachau courts. And it's the human drama of how he came to terms with his own anti-German feelings living and working in a Germany still heaped with rubble and ruled by the black market, in the shadow of the looming Iron Curtain and approaching Cold War.

Innocent at Dachau is also the story of how, four decades later, Joe Halow went back — back to the long-classified records of the Army's trials at Dachau where he found astounding confirmation from official sources of his own misgivings about the trials; and back to Germany for a moving visit with one of the German SS men Halow watched testify about his role at Nordhausen concentration camp.

Outspoken, informative, moving, ***Innocent at Dachau*** is a unique testimony to one American's quest for truth, understanding and honor, in a realm ruled even today by shibboleth and taboo — a book that deserves to be read, and read again.

Joseph Halow was born and raised in Altoona, Pennsylvania. After a brief stint in the U.S. Army following World War II, during which he served in Peking, China, Mr. Halow served as a court reporter at the U.S. Army war crimes trials at Dachau. Mr. Halow has had a long career in the export-import business, during which he headed an association that promoted the exportation of American grain. A Phi Beta Kappa graduate of The George Washington University, Joseph Halow is the author of numerous articles on agricultural affairs, as well as a book, *U.S. Grain: The Political Commodity*. He lives near Washington, D.C.



TOP: The author at publisher's 1990 historical conference. **INSET**: Germany, 1946: The author transcribing his courtroom "take" for the record.

INNOCENT AT DACHAU

by Joseph Halow

Clothbound, 337 pages, Photos, Index

$16.50 postpaid

published by

The Institute for Historical Review

P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659

Advance To Barbarism

The Development of Total Warfare

F. J. P. Veale

In this eloquent and provocative work, an English attorney with a profound understanding of military history traces the evolution of warfare from primitive savagery to the rise of a "civilized" code that was first threatened in our own Civil War, again in the First World War, and finally shattered during the Second World War — the most destructive conflict in history.

As the author compellingly argues, the ensuing "War Crimes Trials" at Nuremberg and Tokyo, and their more numerous and barbaric imitations in Communist-controlled eastern Europe, established the perilous principle that "the most serious war crime is to be on the losing side."

Out of print for many years, this classic work of revisionist history — a moving denunciation of hate-propaganda and barbarism — is once again available in a well-referenced new IHR edition with a detailed index.



CRITICAL PRAISE FOR *ADVANCE TO BARBARISM:*

This is a relentlessly truth-speaking book. The truths it speaks are bitter, but of paramount importance if civilization is to survive. —**Max Eastman**

I have read the book with deep interest and enthusiasm. It is original in its approach to modern warfare, cogent and convincing. . . His indictment of modern warfare and post-war trials must stand. —**Norman Thomas**

The best general book on the Nuremberg Trials. It not only reveals the illegality, fundamental immorality and hypocrisy of these trials, but also shows how they are bound to make any future world wars (or any important wars) far more brutal and destructive to life and property. A very readable and impressive volume and a major contribution to any rational peace movement. —**Harry Elmer Barnes**

. . . Indispensable to earnest students of the nature and effects of warfare. It contains trenchant criticisms of the Nuremberg trials, and it exposes the stupidities of "peace-loving" politicians. —**Francis Neilson**

. . . A very outstanding book . . . —**General J.F.C. Fuller**

This is a book of great importance. Displaying the rare combination of a deep knowledge of military history and an acute legal insight, it is a brilliant and courageous exposition of the case for civilization. —**Captain Russell Grenfell**

ADVANCE TO BARBARISM
Quality Softcover • 363 pages
$11.45 postpaid
Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 2739 • Newport Beach, CA 92659